DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 170		EC 201 784
AUTHOR	DeStefano, Lizanne; And Others	
TITLE	Review of Student Assessment Instruments and Practices in Use in Secondary/Transition Projects. Revised Edition.	
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Champaign. Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Inst.	
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.	
PUB DATE	May 87	
CONTRACT	300-85-0160	
NOTE	312p.; For the 1986 edition, see ED 279 123.	
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Book/Product Reviews (072)	
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.	
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Tests; Adjustment (to Environment); Aptitude Tests; Career Choice; Competency Based Education; Daily Living Skills; Diagnostic Tests; *Disabilities; *Educational Testing; *Education Work Relationship; *Evaluation Methods; Intelligence Tests; Interpersonal Competence; Language Tests; Personality Measures; Postsecondary Education; Psychomotor Skills; Screening Tests; Secondary Education; *Student Evaluation; *Transitional Programs; Vocational Aptitude	

ABSTRACT

The research study sought to determine the status of student assessment instrumentation and practices in programs dealing with the transition of special education students from school to work or postsecondary education, and to determine areas where current practice was not able to meet the changing demands of transitional services. Transition projects funded by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services were surveyed to determine the student competencies assessed, commercially available or locally developed instruments used, and usefulness of the information obtained. Twelve competency categories were identified: general ability/intelligence, special ability, vocational skills, academic achievement, language, adaptive behavior, social skills, career interest, motor skills/dexterity, lifestyle/consumer satisfaction, daily living skills, and survival skills. Following an overall analysis of the projects' use of the identified instruments, 3 appendixes provide: (1) the survey instrument; (2) reviews of 141 of the instruments, providing such information as publisher, cost, date of publication, competencies assessed, population characteristics, recommended uses, test content and format, skills/materials required, norming/standardization practices, reliability, and validity; and (3) a bibliography. (JDD)

****

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

****

8555

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lizanne DeStefano
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED291170

Review of Student Assessment Instruments and Practices, Revised

DeStefano
Linn
Markward

EC 201 784

TRANSITION
INSTITUTE
AT ILLINOIS

The following principles guide our research related to the education and employment of youth and adults with specialized education, training, employment, and adjustment needs.

- Individuals have a basic right to be educated and to work in the environment that least restricts their right to learn and interact with other students and persons who are not handicapped.
- Individuals with varied abilities, social backgrounds, aptitudes, and learning styles must have equal access and opportunity to engage in education and work, and life-long learning.
- Educational experiences must be planned, delivered, and evaluated based upon the unique abilities, social backgrounds, and learning styles of the individual.
- Agencies, organizations, and individuals from a broad array of disciplines and professional fields must effectively and systematically coordinate their efforts to meet individual education and employment needs.
- Individuals grow and mature throughout their lives requiring varying levels and types of educational and employment support.
- The capability of an individual to obtain and hold meaningful and productive employment is important to the individual's quality of life.
- Parents, advocates, and friends form a vitally important social network that is an instrumental aspect of education, transition to employment, and continuing employment.

The Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute is funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education (contract number 300-85-0160).

Project Officer: Dr. Mel Appell

For more information on the Transition Institute at Illinois, please contact:

Dr. Frank R. Rusch, *Director*
College of Education
University of Illinois
110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

Review of Student Assessment Instruments and Practices in Use in Secondary/Transition Projects

Lizanne DeStefano

Robert Linn

Martha Markward

Revised Edition

May 1987

EC 201784

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the CSERS-funded secondary/transition project staff members who responded to our survey and follow-up phone calls. It is our hope that this document will be of use to them. In addition we are indebted to Cal Chaplin for her expert assistance in all phases of this project and to Debra Thompson, and Sigrid Danielson for their help in its completion. Sincere thanks to Lynda Leach, June Chambliss and her staff, and others at the Transition Institute who assisted in the preparation of the final document.

Lizanne DeStefano

Robert Linn

Martha Markward

University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign

© 1987 by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

Contents

Page

List of Tables v

Summary of Findings from Project Surveys 1

  Procedures 1

  Results 6

  Conclusions 41

Appendix A. Model Programs Survey 45

Appendix B. Reviews of Commercially Available Assessment Instruments 51

    List of Test Reviews 53

    Introduction 59

    Test Reviews 63

Appendix C. Bibliography 297

List of Tables

Page

Table 1. Response Rate for Model Projects Survey 5

Table 2. Commercially available instruments used by secondary/transition projects 7

Table 3. Projects' utility rating for general ability/ intelligence tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 13

Table 4. Projects' reported use of data from general ability/intelligence tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 14

Table 5. Projects' utility rating for special ability tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 17

Table 6. Projects' reported use of data from special ability tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 18

Table 7. Projects' utility rating for vocational skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 20

Table 8. Projects' reported use of data from vocational skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 21

Table 9. Projects' utility rating for academic achievement tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 22

Page

Table 10. Projects' reported use of data from academic achievement tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 23

Table 11. Projects' utility rating for language tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 25

Table 12. Projects' reported use of data from language tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 26

Table 13. Projects' utility rating for adaptive behavior tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 27

Table 14. Projects' reported use of data from adaptive behavior tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 28

Table 15. Projects' utility rating for social skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 29

Table 16. Projects' reported use of data from social skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 31

Table 17. Projects' utility rating for career interest/awareness tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 32

Table 18. Projects' reported use of data from career interest/awareness tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 33

Table 19. Projects' utility rating for survival skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 34

Table 20. Projects' reported use of data from survival skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 35

Table 21. Projects' utility rating for daily living skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 37

Table 22. Projects' reported use of data from daily living skills tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 38

Table 23. Projects' utility for motor skills/dexterity tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 39

Table 24. Projects' reported use of data from motor skills/dexterity tests by funding competition and handicapping condition served 40

Table 25. Frequency of projects that reported local instrument development 42

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM PROJECT SURVEYS

Over the last decade educational practices in secondary special education have shifted from school-based, academic programs to community-based, life-skill oriented instruction designed to prepare the student for a maximally integrated and productive community life. This shift has resulted in different goals and expectations for the postsecondary status of youth with handicaps. College attendance or postsecondary training is a consideration for many students with milder handicaps, and competitive employment may be considered a vocational option for all students.

The purpose of this research study was to determine the current status of instrumentation and practices of student assessment in programs dealing with the transition of special education students from school to work or postsecondary education and to determine areas where current practice was not able to meet the changing demands of transitional services.

Procedures

Population and Setting

The OSERS-funded transition projects served as the sample for this study. In 1985-1987 there were 144 projects funded for periods from 12 to 36 months at an average grant of $100,000. The projects share a common goal: to develop and demonstrate linkages and strategies to smooth the transition of students with handicaps from traditional secondary education programs into postsecondary education or work settings, but each project approaches its task differently. In their meta-analysis of the projects, Laird Heal and L. Allen Phelps of the Transition Institute have identified seven types of secondary projects:

--those that facilitate transition from high school to work;

--those that facilitate transition from high school to post-high school training programs;

--those that facilitate transition from high school to college;

--those that provide support services to college students;

--those that facilitate the transition from college to work;

--those concerned with the development of cooperative models for transition that involve the coordination of numerous agencies; and

--those concerned with replicating model programs or disseminating materials for transitional services.

Within each of these categories, projects differ with respect to the number and handicapping conditions of students and clients served. About one-half of the projects are funded as university projects. One-fourth are associated with state and community education or rehabilitation facilities. The remaining fourth of the projects are distributed among public school districts, community colleges, state departments of education or rehabilitation facilities, trade unions, or private, profit-making agencies. Projects operate statewide and in local communities. Some are located in towns with populations of less than 10,000, whereas others are located in the major metropolitan areas of the country.

Instrumentation

The first major activity under this task was to review each of the OSERS-funded secondary/transition grant applications and to abstract the following information: project title, location, contact person, population served, student characteristics/competencies assessed, methods/measures used, use of assessment data, and timeline for assessment. From this review, 12 areas of student characteristics/ competencies were identified as those most frequently assessed by the projects. Those competencies were: general ability, special aptitude, vocational skills, academic skills, language skills, adaptive behavior, social skills, career interest, survival skills, daily living skills, motor skills/dexterity, and lifestyle/consumer satisfaction. (Because of overlap in instrumentation, the adaptive behavior and survival skills categories are combined in Table 2.)

This categorization system along with the list of instruments developed from the review of the funded grant applications were used in the development of the Model Programs Survey (Appendix A).

The Model Programs Survey is a 19-item self-report questionnaire designed to gather information on (a) which student competencies are assessed in an individual transition project; (b) which commercially available or locally developed instruments are used to assess them; (c) how the assessment information is used; and (d) how useful the assessment information is for its intended purpose.

The Model Programs Survey contains 13 items that cover each of the 12 areas of student competencies assessed by the project and 1 "OTHER" category. Each of these items asks the respondent to rate the usefulness of the information gained from assessment in this category on a 4-point scale:

4 = highly useful
3 = moderately useful
2 = little usefulness
1 = not useful.

The respondent is then asked to indicate the use of this information from four choices:

- --initial assessment for placement
- --assessment for program planning
- --ongoing assessment/monitoring student progress
- --evaluation of program outcome measures.

The respondent is then asked to list the specific instruments used to assess each competency.

Six open-ended questions were included to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses of commercially available tests, to delineate further the information needs of transition projects, and to determine the extent of local instrument development.

Method

First round The survey and an accompanying cover letter were mailed to 114 OSERS project directors on February 25, 1986. A follow-up was conducted on selected nonrespondents on March 18, 1986. Two funding competitions were eliminated from any follow-up activity because projects in both categories were not involved in direct service delivery. A very high response rate was obtained in all other funding competitions (see Table 1). Letters of acknowledgment were sent to all respondents. The first round of survey data collection was declared closed on May 5, 1986.

Second round On January 28, 1987, the survey was mailed to all newly funded OSERS project directors (N=32). Follow-up was conducted on all nonrespondents on February 14, 1987. Once again, a high response rate was obtained.

Table 1. Response Rate for Model Projects Survey

CFDR No.	No. of Projects		No. Returned		% Returned	
	1986	1987	1986	1987	1986	1987
84.158C	7	10	1	8	14	80
84.158B	11		3		27	
84.086M		9		8		89
84.023D	12		8		67	
84.158A	16		10		63	
85.158C	17		13		76	
84.023G	15		11		73	
84.128A	5		5		100	
84.078B	15		10		67	
84.078C	14	13	9	13	64	100
OVERALL						
TOTAL	112	32	70	29	63%	90%

Letters of acknowledgment were sent to all respondents. Round 2 of data collection was declared closed on March 1, 1987.

Analyses

Data coding was completed using the dBASE III software system. Data from the grant application review sheet and the survey were combined and entered into the computer according to a pre-established coding scheme. Statistical analyses were performed to determine:

--the frequency of use for each listed assessment instrument.

--the extent to which each area of student characteristics/ competencies is assessed by type of project and type of handicapping condition.

--differences in assessment practices between project type and types of handicapping condition served.

--differences in the usage of test data by assessment instrument, category of competency, project type, and type of handicapping condition served.

Results

A total of 144 assessment instruments were listed as being used by one or more of the transition projects. Appendix B contains brief reviews of all but 3 of the listed instruments, which were excluded because of incomplete information or inability to locate the instrument. Table 2 provides a complete listing of instruments and the number of projects citing use of each of the 144 instruments organized by the 12 common competency categories and "other." As can be seen, traditional tests of general ability (e.g., the WISC-R, listed by 25 projects, and the WAIS-R, listed by 34 projects) are among the most frequently cited instruments. Also mentioned frequently were measures of vocational skills, particularly

Table 2. Commercially Available Instruments Used by Secondary/Transition Projects

Competency Assessed	No. of projects citing use		
	1986 N=70	1987 N=29	TOTAL
General Ability/Intelligence			
Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)*	1	1	2
General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)*	9	1	10
Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (KABC)*	1	1	2
Leiter*	2	3	5
Ravens Standard Progressive Matrices*	5	1	6
Revised Beta Examination*	2	1	3
Slosson Intelligence Test*	3	2	5
Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale - Fourth Edition*	5	2	7
WAIS-R*	29	5	34
WISC-R*	19	6	25
Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery: Tests of Ability*	14	4	18
Special Ability			
Aptitude Test for Occupations*	1		1
Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity*	8	1	8
Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test*	9	2	11
California Aptitude for Special Occupations*	1		1
Crawford Small Parts*	6	2	8
Differential Aptitude Test (DAT)*	4		4
General Clerical Test*	1		1
Minnesota Clerical Test*	4	2	6
Minnesota Paper Form Board Test - Revised*	4	2	6
Minnesota Rate of Manipulation*	4		4
Minnesota Spatial Relations Test*	3		3
OASIS-A*	2		2
SRA Computer Programmer Aptitude Battery*	1	1	2
Vocational Skills			
APTICOM*	2		2
Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS)*	1	2	3
CHOICE*		1	1
Comprehensive Occupational Assessment and Training Systems (COATS)*	5		5

*Reviewed in Appendix B.

Table 2 (Continued)

	No. of projects citing use		
	1986 N=70	1987 N=29	TOTAL
Forer Vocational Survey*	1		1
Jewish Employment and Vocational Service Work Sample System (JEVS)*	5	3	8
McCarron Prevocational Assessment*	3		3
McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System*	11	5	16
Microcomputer Evaluation Screening Assessment (MESA)*	11	2	13
Microtower*	3		3
Personnel Tests for Industry: Oral Direction Test*		2	2
Prevocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (PACG)*	5	1	6
San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale (SFCS)*	1		1
Singer Vocational Evaluation System*	6	1	7
Talent Assessment Program (TAP)*	4	1	5
TOWER*	2		2
Vocational Aptitude and Curriculum Guide (VACG)*	4		4
VALPAR work samples*	20	4	24
Vocational Information and Evaluation Work Samples (VIEWS)*	5	1	6
Wide Range Employability Sample Test (WREST)*	2		2
Academic Achievement			
ACT*	1		1
Botel Word Opposites*	1		1
California Achievement Test (CAT)*	3	1	4
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension/ Vocabulary*	5	1	6
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)*		1	1
Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (K-TEA)*	1	1	2
Key Math*	6	1	7
Nelson-Denny Reading Test*		2	2
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)*	5	3	8
Reading for Understanding (RFU)*	1		1
Stanford Achievement (TASK)*	1		1
SAT (Special Administration)*	1	1	2
SRA Reading and Math*		1	1
Stanford Diagnostic-Reading*	1		1
Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)*	2	1	3
Test of General Educational Development (GED)*	4	1	5
Wide Range Achievement Test - Revised*	27	13	40
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (WRMT)*	5		5
Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery: Tests of Academic Achievement*		8	8

*Reviewed in Appendix B.

Table 2 (Continued)

	No. of projects citing use		
	1986 N=70	1987 N=29	TOTAL
Language			
Bankson Language Screening Test*		1	1
Carrow Elicited Language Inventory (CELI)*	1	2	3
Clinical Evaluation of Language Functions (CELF)*		1	1
English Language Skills Assessment (ELSA)*		1	1
Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination*	1		1
Modern Language Aptitude Test*	1		1
PPVT-R*	14	8	22
Pre-School Language Scale*		1	1
Slingerland Language Ability Test*	1		1
SRA Verbal*	3		3
Test of Adolescent Language (TOAL)*	2	2	4
Test of Language Development-Intermediate (TOLD)*	2	1	3
Test of Written Language (TOWL)*	3	3	6
Adaptive Behavior/Survival Skills			
AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale*	9	2	11
Assessment of Independent Living Skills (AILS)*	3		3
Elwyn Remedial Inventory One*	1		1
Inventory for Client and Agency Planning (ICAP)*		1	1
Scales of Independent Behavior*	2	1	3
Street Survival Skills Questionnaire (SSSQ)*	13	1	14
Test for Everyday Living (TEL)*	6	6	6
Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales - Revised*	9	4	13
Social Skills			
Defense Mechanism Inventory (DMI)*	1		1
Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B)*	1		1
Social and Prevocational Information Battery (SPIB & SPIB-T)*	14	2	16
Social Performance Survey Schedule (SPSS)*		1	1
Test of Interpersonal Competency for Employment (TICE)*	1		1
Waksman Social Skills Rating Form*	1		1
Career Interest			
Becker Reading-Free Interest Survey*	11	3	14
California Occupational Preference System (COPS)*	4	2	6

*Reviewed in Appendix B.

Table 2 (Continued)

	No. of projects citing use		
	1986 N=70	1987 N=29	TOTAL
Career Assessment Inventory (CAI)*	4	1	5
Career Development Inventory (CDI)*	4		4
Career Maturity Inventory (CMI)*	2		2
CASE	1	1	2
Choosing a Major at Penn State*	1		1
Geist Picture Interest Inventory*	2		2
Gordon Occupational Checklist*	3		3
Hall Occupational Orientation Inventory*	1		1
Harrington O'Shea System for Career Decision Making*	2		2
Holland Self-Directed Search*	2	3	5
Interest Determination Exploration Assessment System (IDEAS)*	2		2
Knowledge of the World of Work Scale*	1		1
Kuder Vocational Preference Record*	3		3
Minnesota Occupational Importance Questionnaire*	3		3
Pictorial Inventory of Careers*	1		1
Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory*	4	3	7
U.S. Department of Labor Interest Survey*	3	1	4
Wide Range Interest and Opinion Test (WRIOT)*	11	5	16
Motor Skills/Dexterity			
Bender Gestalt*	3		3
Purdue Pegboard*	12	1	13
Pennsylvania Bimanual Dexterity*	1		1
Stromberg Dexterity Test*	1		1
USES Pegboard*		1	1
USES Washerboard*		1	1
Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction			
Janis-Field Attitude Inventory*		1	1
Leisure Diagnostic Battery		1	1
Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale*	2		2
Daily Living/Survival Skills			
Brigance Inventory of Essential Skills*	7	3	10
Coping Mastery Scales*	1		1
Leisure Time Activities Scale*	1		1
Nagi Index of Disability*	1		1
Social Network Checklist*	1		1

*Reviewed in Appendix B.

Table 2 (Continued)

Other	No. of projects citing use 1986 N=70	 1987 N=29	 TOTAL
Bloomer Learning Test*		1	1
Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale*	1		1
Canfield Learning Styles Inventory*		1	1
Coopersmith Self Esteem*	3		3
COPES*	1		1
Daly Scale of Writing Apprehension*		1	1
Family Burden Questionnaire*	1		1
Functional Assessment Inventory*	1		1
Global Assessment Scale*	1		1
High School Personality Questionnaire		1	1
Home Activity Interview*		1	1
Kolb Learning Styles Inventory*		2	2
Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control*	2		2
Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale*	1		1
Rotter Locus of Control*	1		1
Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*	1		1
Temperament and Values Inventory*	1		1
VITAS*	1		1
Walker Problem Identification Checklist*		1	1
Weller Strawser	1	1	2

*Reviewed in Appendix B.

the VALPAR Work Samples (24 projects), and, to a lesser extent, the McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System (16 projects) and the Microcomputer Evaluation Screening Assessment System (MESA) (13 projects).

Although a number of measures of academic achievement were used by the projects, by far the most commonly used was the Wide Range Achievement Test (40 projects). Other instruments that were used by ten or more of the projects are the Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (10), Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery (18), the Becker Reading-Free Interest Survey (14), Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills (10), the Wide Range Interest and Opinion Test (16), Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale (13), the Purdue Pegboard (13), the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (22), the Street Survival Skills Questionnaire (14), the Social and Prevocational Information Battery (16), the Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test (11), and the Microcomputer Evaluation Screening Assessment (13).

There was little evidence of much use of contemporary situational assessment advocated by several authors (e.g., Menchetti, Rusch, & Owens, 1983; Pancsofar, 1985). Rather, traditional assessment approaches relying on well-established standardized instruments were overwhelmingly in use by the projects.

The utility ratings and the uses made of the assessment results are summarized in pairs of tables for each competency category. For example, Table 3 lists the means and standard deviations (S.D.) of the utility ratings of instruments in the general ability/intelligence category, and Table 4 lists the number of projects that reported using instruments in this category for each of the four major purposes. Because of their homogeneity, data from 1986 and 1987 are aggregated. Both tables report

Table 3. Projects' Utility Rating for General Ability/Intelligence Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 44)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	7	2.43	1.13
84.023G	6	2.00	1.10
84.158A	9	2.89	1.05
84.158B	1	4.00	----
85.158C	6	2.67	1.60
84.158C	9	3.19	.96
84.078B	4	3.50	.58
84.078C	27	2.48	.91
84.128A	4	3.50	.58
84.086M	9	1.70	.87
Total	76	2.83	.88

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	40	3.33	.81
EMR	12	3.02	1.09
TMR	6	3.00	1.10
SMR	23	1.54	1.51

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	39	3.10	.84
Moderate	10	2.70	1.25
Severe	30	1.37	1.12

Table 4. Projects' Reported Use of Data from General Ability Intelligence Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	7	4	3	0	0
84.023G	6	1	2	2	1
84.158A	9	3	5	1	1
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	9	6	24	2	1
85.158C	6	1	3	2	0
84.078B	4	2	2	0	0
84.078C	27	13	10	2	3
84.128A	4	3	3	3	2
84,986M	9	2	2	2	0
Total	76	35	35	14	8

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	40	26	18	3	4
Educable mentally retarded	12	8	7	1	3
Trainable mentally retarded	6	5	4	3	1
Severely mentally retarded	23	2	2	2	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	0	0	0
Physically handicapped	1	0	0	1	1
Multiply handicapped	3	2	3	0	0
Emotionally disturbed	2	2	1	1	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	39	32	25	4	7
Moderate	10	9	8	7	3
Severe	30	10	9	5	2

the results by funding competition and handicapping condition served. The latter utility rating results are reported only for the five handicapping conditions that are most frequently served by the projects (LD, EMR, TMR, and SMR) and for three composite categories (mild, moderate, or severe). Only the listing of number of projects by funding category can be summed to determine the total number of projects reporting use of instruments to assess competencies in a given category because a single project may serve students with more than one handicapping condition and therefore may be included in, for example, both the LD and EMR or in both the mild and moderate results.

General Ability/Intelligence

As Table 3 shows, the utility ratings for general ability/intelligence measures were generally close to 3 (moderately useful). As might be expected, however, the mean utility ratings were lowest for projects serving students with severe handicapping conditions (mean = 1.37) and highest for those serving students with mild handicapping conditions (mean = 3.10), whereas those serving students with moderate handicapping conditions fell in between (mean = 2.70). Within each group of projects there was a substantial degree of variability in the utility ratings, as is indicated by the standard deviations. On the 4-point scale used for the utility ratings, the standard deviations of 1.0 or higher reflect the fact that it was not unusual for the full range of the scale (from 1, not useful, to 4, highly useful) to be used by different projects serving students with similar handicapping conditions.

Table 4 indicates that measures of general ability/intelligence were used most frequently for program planning/IEP development, although it is also common to use such measures for initial assessment/diagnosis. Somewhat surprisingly, eight of the projects reported that measures of general ability were also used to assess student outcomes for purposes of program evaluation. It seems somewhat unlikely that measures in this category are apt to be very sensitive to the effects of transition programs. Fourteen projects reported using general ability instruments in a repeated measures fashion to monitor progress. This is also disturbing as the psychometric properties of these tests indicate that they are resistant to change over time.

Special Abilities

The results for measures of special abilities are reported in Tables 5 and 6. The organization of these tables and subsequent pairs of tables parallels that of Tables 3 and 4. They show respectively the means and standard deviations of the utility ratings and the number of projects reporting each of the four major uses of the instruments. Use of special ability tests was much less common (43 projects) than use of general ability tests (76 projects). The mean utility ratings for the special ability test were generally lower than the general ability tests. The biggest discrepancy in utility ratings was found for projects serving students with moderate handicapping conditions. Those projects reported that measures of special abilities had "little usefulness" (mean = 2.00), whereas general ability tests were found to be "moderately useful" (mean = 2.70). The generally low utility rating of the special abilities tests may be attributed to the common criticism that test content bears little relation to actual skills required for success on the job and test norms are now equated to real world productivity standards.

The distribution of reported uses of special ability tests has a pattern similar to the one found for general ability tests. Program planning/IEP development was most frequently cited (all but 12 of the 43

Table 5. Projects' Utility Rating for Special Ability Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 35)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	5	2.00	1.00
84.023G	5	2.60	1.52
84.158A	7	2.71	1.38
84.158B	1	4.00	0
84.158C	6	2.66	1.21
85.158C	5	2.80	1.10
84.078B	3	2.67	1.15
84.078C	6	2.40	1.04
84.128A	4	3.50	.71
84.086M	1	2.00	0
Total	43	2.73	.91

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	14	2.41	.87
EMR	7	3.00	.82
TMR	5	2.00	2.12
SMR	7	2.86	1.38

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	21	2.58	.89
Moderate	8	2.00	1.85
Severe	16	2.13	.76

Table 6. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Special Ability Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	5	1	3	0	0
84.023G	5	1	2	1	1
84.158A	7	3	5	1	1
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	6	5	4	3	2
85.158C	5	1	3	2	0
84.078B	3	2	2	0	0
84.078C	6	5	5	2	1
84.128A	4	3	3	3	2
84.086M	1	1	0	0	0
Total	43	22	28	12	7

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	14	8	10	2	1
Educable mentally retarded	7	2	6	3	1
Trainable mentally retarded	5	2	4	2	1
Severely mentally retarded	7	0	0	0	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	0	0
Physically handicapped	0	0	0	0	0
Multiply handicapped	1	1	1	0	0
Emotionally disturbed	1	1	1	0	0

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	21	10	16	5	2
Moderate	8	4	8	4	2
Severe	16	1	8	1	1

projects using special ability tests reported that they were used for this purpose). About half the projects also reported using special ability tests for initial assessment/diagnosis, about a third for ongoing assessment/student monitoring, and seven projects reported using them for assessing student outcomes/program evaluation.

Vocational Skills

Vocational tests (Tables 7 and 8) were used by a total of 56 projects and generally received reasonably high utility ratings regardless of the handicapping conditions of the students served. Note, for example, that the means for the mild, moderate, and severe composite groupings are all at or slightly above 3.0 and differ from each other by only .17. As would be expected, vocational tests were used much more frequently for assessing student outcomes/program evaluation than were tests of general or special abilities. Thirty-three of the projects reported using vocational tests for this purpose. No other category of measures was used by as many projects for program evaluation. Vocational tests are used by projects for the other three purposes investigated with even greater frequency, however.

Academic Achievement

The pattern of utility ratings and the uses cited for tests of academic achievement (Tables 9 and 10), among which the Wide Range Achievement Test is the most widely used, are reasonably consistent with expectations. They were used most and seen to have the greatest utility by projects serving students with mild handicapping conditions. The mean utility ratings for these projects is 3.10, compared to means of 2.12 and 1.70 for projects serving students with moderate or severe handicapping conditions, respectively. About two-thirds of the projects use academic achievement tests for initial assessment and program planning, whereas

Table 7. Projects' Utility Rating for Vocational Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 61)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	7	3.00	1.00
84.023G	6	2.67	1.37
84.158A	10	3.70	.48
84.158B	1	4.00	0
84.158C	8	2.50	1.23
85.158C	8	2.88	1.25
84.078B	6	3.00	1.26
84.078C	8	2.75	.35
84.128A	2	3.50	.71
84.086M	4	2.38	1.10
Total	60	3.04	.88

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	15	3.07	1.1
EMR	10	3.00	.94
TMR	7	3.29	1.11
SMR	8	3.25	1.16

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	24	3.17	.83
Moderate	12	3.08	1.16
Severe	22	3.00	.76

Table 8. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Vocational Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	7	2	4	4	3
84.023C	6	3	3	2	1
84.158A	10	5	9	6	5
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	8	6	6	4	2
85.158C	8	2	6	5	4
84.078B	6	4	6	2	4
84.078C	8	5	8	7	7
84.128A	2	2	2	2	2
84.086M	4	2	2	2	2
Total	62	37	47	34	28

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	16	9	16	7	9
Educable mentally retarded	10	4	10	6	5
Trainable mentally retarded	9	4	9	5	3
Severely mentally retarded	1	0	1	1	1
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	1	1
Physically handicapped	2	1	2	1	1
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	0	0
Emotionally disturbed	2	2	2	1	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	24	12	24	11	12
Moderate	12	8	12	11	7
Severe	22	13	15	10	8

Table 9. Projects' Utility Rating for Academic Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 56)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	5	2.40	1.34
84.023G	5	2.40	1.34
84.158A	7	2.71	1.11
84.158B	1	1.00	----
84.158C	7	2.42	1.14
85.158C	8	3.00	.93
84.078B	4	3.25	.50
84.078C	11	3.05	.86
84.128A	4	2.75	1.26
84.086M	4	1.38	.75
Total	56	2.44	.92

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	23	3.06	.74
EMR	7	3.14	.69
TMR	4	2.75	1.26
SMR	8	2.38	1.30

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	20	3.10	.64
Moderate	8	2.12	1.25
Severe	18	1.70	.90

Table 10. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Academic Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	5	2	2	1	1
84.023G	5	3	1	2	2
84.158A	7	4	2	2	1
84.158B	1	0	0	0	0
84.158C	7	4	3	4	1
85.158C	8	7	7	4	4
84.078B	5	5	3	1	2
84.078C	11	11	11	5	6
84.128A	4	8	10	4	8
84.086M	4	2	0	1	0
Total	56	44	39	24	22

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	23	23	20	8	10
Educable mentally retarded	7	5	5	3	2
Trainable mentally retarded	4	5	6	4	4
Severely mentally retarded	0	0	0	0	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	0	0	0	0	0
Physically handicapped	1	1	1	0	0
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	0	1
Emotionally disturbed	4	4	2	2	2

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	20	19	15	10	9
Moderate	8	10	13	8	8
Severe	18	13	7	4	4

only about half that number use them for the other two purposes (monitoring student progress or program evaluation).

Language

Language tests (Tables 11 and 12) were used most frequently by projects serving students with severe handicapping conditions. They were judged to have the greatest utility by projects in the mild composite grouping (mean = 3.27) and least useful by those in the moderate grouping (mean = 2.17). Most of the projects reporting use of language tests used them for initial assessment and program planning. Thirteen of the projects also used language tests for monitoring student progress, and fifteen of them reported that they were used for program evaluation.

Adaptive Behavior

Adaptive behavior measures (e.g., the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale and the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales) were generally found to be moderately to highly useful regardless of the clustering of projects. The means for composite groupings of projects ranged only from 2.60 to 3.08 (see Table 13). In most cases, the standard deviations of the ratings were also relatively small.

The reported uses of adaptive behavior instruments (Table 14) for the four purposes investigated are nearly equal for the three composite groupings of projects by the nature of the handicapping conditions of the students. About two-thirds of the projects reported using such instruments for each of the first three purposes (initial assessment, program planning, and monitoring of student progress), while a little less than half report using them for purposes of program evaluation.

Social Skills

As Table 15 indicates, social skills tests (e.g., the Social and Prevocational Information Battery) had very high utility ratings. These tests were rated as either moderately or highly useful by most of

Table 11. Projects' Utility Rating for Language Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N =44)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	3	1.67	.58
84.023G	4	2.00	1.41
84.158A	5	2.40	.55
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	7	2.50	1.14
85.158C	8	2.00	1.13
84.078B	1	3.00	----
84.078C	8	3.00	1,17
84.128A	4	3.00	.82
84.086M	3	2.00	1.00
Total	44	2.56	.78

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	14	3.00	1.01
EMR	3	3.33	.58
TMR	3	3.00	1.00
SMR	8	2.62	1.19

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	11	3.27	.79
Moderate	6	2.17	1.17
Severe	18	2.60	1.08

Table 12. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Language Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	3	1	2	1	1
84.023C	4	2	0	1	1
84.158A	5	4	1	0	1
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	7	5	4	3	2
85.158C	8	6	6	3	3
84.078B	1	2	2	0	0
84.078C	8	6	5	3	3
84.128A	4	6	7	1	3
84.086M	3	3	1	1	1
Total	44	35	29	13	15

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	14	8	10	5	5
Educable mentally retarded	3	1	4	1	1
Trainable mentally retarded	3	4	4	1	2
Severely mentally retarded	8	1	1	1	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	0	0	0
Physically handicapped	0	0	0	0	0
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	0	1
Emotionally disturbed	0	0	0	0	0

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	17	9	12	5	5
Moderate	8	8	8	2	4
Severe	10	6	8	4	4

Table 13. Projects' Utility Rating for Adaptive Behavior Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 43)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	3	2.67	1.53
84.023G	5	2.20	.84
84.158A	7	3.00	.58
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	6	3.13	.63
85.158C	6	3.00	.63
84.078B	1	3.00	----
84.078C	7	2.80	1.50
84.128A	4	3.50	.58
84.086M	3	2.30	1.15
Total	43	2.97	.74

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	10	3.75	1.15
EMR	6	3.17	.41
TMR	4	2.75	.50
SMR	8	3.25	.71

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	16	3.08	.64
Moderate	11	2.75	.89
Severe	19	2.60	1.03

Table 14. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Adaptive Behavior Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	3	1	2	2	2
84.023G	5	1	1	1	1
84.158A	7	4	3	3	2
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	6	6	4	3	2
85.158C	6	5	5	5	2
84.078B	1	1	0	1	1
84.078C	7	5	3	3	3
84.128A	4	4	4	4	3
84.086M	3	3	1	1	1
Total	43	30	24	23	17

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	10	5	7	6	4
Educable mentally retarded	6	4	4	3	2
Trainable mentally retarded	4	4	5	4	1
Severely mentally retarded	8	0	1	1	1
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	0	0	0
Physically handicapped	1	1	1	1	1
Multiply handicapped	0	0	0	0	0
Emotionally disturbed	1	0	0	1	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	16	7	9	8	5
Moderate	11	9	11	9	3
Severe	19	11	10	7	1

Table 15. Projects' Utility Rating for Social Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 40)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	4	3.75	.50
84.023G	7	2.86	1.07
84.158A	4	4.00	.00
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	5	3.30	1.75
85.158C	8	3.12	.83
84.078B	3	3.67	.58
84.078C	4	3.75	.35
84.128A	2	3.50	.71
84.086M	2	2.75	1.06
Total	40	3.37	.68

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	13	3.50	.56
EMR	7	3.57	.53
TMR	4	4.00	.00
SMR	5	3.60	.89

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	18	3.44	.51
Moderate	6	3.50	1.22
Severe	15	3.40	.86

the projects using such measures. All four projects serving students with moderate retardation that used a social skills measure, for example, rated the measures as highly useful. All three composite groupings of projects in terms of the handicapping conditions of the students served had utility ratings approximately midway between moderately and highly useful.

Table 16 shows that measures of social skills were used by a substantial number of projects for each of the four listed purposes. With the exception of vocational skills tests, measures of social skills were used to assess student outcomes/program evaluation by more projects than any other category of measures.

Career Interests/Awareness

As was shown in Table 2, 23 different instruments were used to assess student interests and career awareness. These instruments were used for program planning by most projects and were generally judged to be more useful for persons with mild handicaps than the other composite groupings (Tables 17 and 18). About one-third the projects also made use of career interest or awareness measures for purposes of initial assessment or the monitoring of student progress, and nine of the projects reported that instruments in this category were used for assessing student outcomes for program evaluation.

Survival Skills

The measures of survival skills (Tables 19 and 20) were judged to be least useful by projects serving students with mild handicapping conditions (mean = 2.62). For projects in the other two composite groupings, however, these measures received high utility ratings (means = 3.33 for both projects serving students with moderate and severe handicapping conditions). A majority of the projects indicated that survival skills

Table 16. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Social Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	4	2	4	2	2
84.023C	7	3	4	3	2
84.158A	4	3	4	3	3
84.158B	1	1	0	0	0
84.158C	5	3	4	4	3
85.158C	8	5	6	7	4
84.078B	3	1	3	1	3
84.078C	7	7	7	6	4
84.128A	7	4	7	5	4
84.086M	2	0	1	1	0
TOTAL	40	29	40	32	25

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning Disabled	13	7	13	9	10
Educable mentally retarded	7	4	7	5	5
Trainable mentally retarded	4	3	5	4	3
Severely mentally retarded	5	1	1	1	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	0	0
Physically handicapped	1	0	1	1	1
Multiply handicapped	1	0	0	1	0
Emotionally Disturbed	3	3	3	3	2

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	20	9	19	13	14
Moderate	10	6	10	8	6
Severe	15	8	11	9	6

Table 17. Projects' Utility Rating for Career Interest/Awareness Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 61)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	6	3.33	.59
84.023G	6	2.50	1.22
84.158A	9	3.00	1.00
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	7	2.50	.71
84.158C	6	2.83	.98
84.078B	4	3.25	.50
84.078C	8	3.33	.51
84.128A	10	3.33	.58
84.086M	4	1.63	.75
Total	61	2.97	.68

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	19	3.38	.51
EMR	8	3.38	.52
TMR	6	3.00	1.10
SMR	7	3.14	1.21

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	21	3.38	.50
Moderate	11	3.02	.98
Severe	21	2.68	.98

Table 18. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Career Interest Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	6	5	6	2	2
84.023G	6	3	3	2	1
84.158A	9	5	7	2	0
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	7	5	4	3	1
85.158C	6	3	5	3	0
84.078B	4	1	3	2	2
84.078C	8	6	8	6	1
84.128A	10	6	10	4	1
84.086M	4	4	2	1	1
Total	61	37	50	24	9

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	19	9	18	7	4
Educable mentally retarded	8	6	8	2	2
Trainable mentally retarded	6	4	7	3	0
Severely mentally retarded	7	0	1	1	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	0	0
Physically handicapped	2	1	2	1	0
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	1	0
Emotionally disturbed	3	3	3	1	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	29	13	22	7	6
Moderate	11	9	15	6	0
Severe	21	12	16	8	8

Table 19. Projects' Utility Rating for Survival Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 45)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	5	3.40	.89
84.023G	4	2.25	1.50
84.158A	6	3.50	.58
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	5	3.00	.53
85.158C	5	3.00	.71
84.078B	1	4.00	----
84.078C	5	2.75	.71
84.128A	9	3.50	.58
84.086M	3	2.67	1.44
Total	45	3.21	.69

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	8	2.83	1.17
EMR	7	2.43	1.13
TMR	4	3.50	.58
SMR	8	3.12	.99

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	13	2.62	1.12
Moderate	9	3.33	1.00
Severe	18	3.33	1.01

Table 20. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Survival Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	5	4	4	4	3
84.023G	4	2	1	1	1
84.158A	6	5	5	4	1
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	5	1	1	1	1
85.158C	5	5	5	5	5
84.078B	1	1	1	1	1
84.078C	6	6	6	5	4
84.128A	9	7	9	7	5
84.086M	3	0	2	1	2
Total	45	31	35	29	23

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	8	7	8	5	7
Educable mentally retarded	7	4	6	3	4
Trainable mentally retarded	4	4	5	5	3
Severely mentally retarded	8	0	0	0	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	0	0
Physically handicapped	2	1	2	2	2
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	0	1
Emotionally disturbed	2	2	2	2	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	13	11	12	7	10
Moderate	9	9	11	11	7
Severe	18	11	14	10	8

measures were used for all four of the listed purposes. The use of these instruments for purposes of program evaluation is more common than for most of the other categories of measures.

Daily Living Skills

The measures of daily living skills received relatively high utility ratings by almost all project groupings (Tables 21 and 22). They were considered to be equally useful by projects serving students with mild, moderate, and severe handicapping conditions. These measures were among the more popular for purposes of program evaluation, with 17 projects reporting use for this purpose. Even a larger proportion of the projects reported that measures of daily living skills were used for each of the other three purposes investigated.

Motor Skills/Dexterity

The last category of measures that was analyzed, motor skills and dexterity tests, was considered to be moderately useful by projects serving students with either mild or severe handicapping conditions but of relatively little usefulness by those serving students with moderate handicapping conditions (Tables 23 and 24). When such measures were used, it was typically for purposes of initial assessment and program planning. They were used only by a few projects for either monitoring student progress or assessing student outcomes for purposes of program evaluation.

Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction

Data were collected on one other category of measures, lifestyle/ consumer satisfaction instruments. Since only five projects reported use of measures in this category, a separate analysis of the pattern of uses of these instruments was not conducted.

Table 21. Projects' Utility Rating for Daily Living Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 33)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	4	3.25	.96
84.023G	6	3.00	1.10
84.158A	4	3.75	.50
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	3	3.00	1.41
85.158C	7	3.28	.49
84.078B	1	4.00	----
84.078C	1	3.00	----
84.128A	2	3.50	.71
84.086M	3	1.58	.80
Total	33	3.33	.62

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	8	3.00	.71
EMR	5	3.50	.58
TMR	5	3.60	.55
SMR	1	3.83	.41

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	10	3.22	.67
Moderate	7	3.14	1.07
Severe	15	3.17	.76

Table 22. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Daily Living Skills Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	4	3	4	4	3
84.023G	6	5	4	4	2
84.158A	4	3	3	2	3
84.158B	3	0	1	0	0
84.158C	2	3	3	3	1
85.158C	7	5	6	5	3
84.078B	1	1	1	1	1
84.078C	1	1	1	1	1
84.128A	2	2	2	2	2
84.086M	3	0	1	1	1
Total	33	23	26	23	17

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	8	6	8	6	5
Educable mentally retarded	5	3	5	2	4
Trainable mentally retarded	5	4	5	4	2
Severely mentally retarded	1	1	1	1	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	0	0
Physically handicapped	0	0	0	0	0
Multiply handicapped	0	1	0	1	0
Emotionally disturbed	3	3	3	3	2

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	13	9	13	8	9
Moderate	10	8	10	8	4
Severe	12	12	12	10	5

Table 23. Projects' Utility Rating for Motor Skills/Dexterity Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served (N = 31)

Range of scores: 1 - 4

CFDR No.	N	Mean	S.D.
84.023D	4	2.00	1.54
84.023G	5	2.80	1.64
84.158A	8	3.12	.99
84.158B	1	4.00	----
84.158C	3	3.15	.71
85.158C	4	2.50	1.00
84.078B	1	3.00	----
84.078C	1	1.00	----
84.128A	2	3.50	.71
84.086M	2	2.75	.25
Total	31	2.79	.68

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Mean	S.D.
LD	8	3.14	.37
EMR	5	3.20	.45
TMR	4	2.75	1.26
SMR	6	3.00	1.55

Composite Groupings	N	Mean	S.D.
Mild	12	3.17	.39
Moderate	8	2.38	1.19
Severe	8	3.08	1.31

Table 24. Projects' Reported Use of Data from Motor Skills/Dexterity Tests by Funding Competition and Handicapping Condition Served

Funding Competition Number	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
84.023D	4	0	2	0	0
84.023G	5	3	2	2	1
84.158A	8	4	5	1	1
84.158B	1	0	1	0	0
84.158C	3	2	2	2	2
85.158C	4	1	2	1	1
84.078B	2	1	2	1	1
84.078C	1	1	1	1	1
84.128A	2	1	1	1	1
84.086M	2	1	1	1	1
Total	31	14	18	10	9

Handicapping Condition Served	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Learning disabled	10	1	10	3	3
Educable mentally retarded	6	2	6	1	1
Trainable mentally retarded	4	2	4	0	0
Severely mentally retarded	0	0	0	0	0
Profoundly mentally retarded	1	1	1	1	1
Physically handicapped	1	0	1	0	0
Multiply handicapped	1	1	0	1	1
Emotionally disturbed	2	1	2	1	1

Composite Groupings	N	Initial Assessment/ Diagnosis	Program Planning/ IEP development	Ongoing Assessment/ Monitoring Student Progress	Assessing Student Outcomes/ Program Evaluation
Mild	16	3	16	4	4
Moderate	8	4	8	0	0
Severe	8	8	7	5	5

Conclusions

In summary, the OSERS-funded secondary transition projects made use of a wide variety of student assessment devices for each of the listed purposes. The most common use is for purposes of program planning and IEP development. Tests of general ability and of vocational skills are used by more projects than any of the other categories of measures. Overall, however, the instruments that were judged to the most useful were measures of social and daily living skills. This is encouraging given the transition initiatives' emphasis on integration and independence. When it came to assessing student outcomes for purposes of program evaluation, vocational skills tests were cited most frequently, but a sizeable number of projects also reported using measures of academic achievement, social skills, survival skills, or daily living skills. This pattern of test use seems quite consistent with the goals of transition projects.

It is clear that substantial use is made of commercially available measures. Although a small number of projects also indicated that they are engaged in local instrument development, they are for outweighed by those projects using standardized instrumentation. The numbers of projects reporting local instrument development by funding competition and handicapping condition served are listed in Table 25.

Table 25. Frequency of Projects that Reported Local Instrument Development

CFDR No.	N
84.023D	4
84.023G	7
84.158A	5
84.158B	1
84.158C	1
84.158C	5
84.078B	1
84.078C	5
84.128A	1
84.086M	1
Total	31

Handicapping Condition Served	N
LD	2
EMR	5
TMR	3
SMR	2

Composite Groupings	N
Mild	12
Moderate	7
Severe	5

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MODEL PROGRAMS SURVEY

Project Name:
Address:

Assessment of Student Competencies

Model Programs Survey

For each of the general categories of measures listed below, please give the name of any measure, including locally developed instruments or observational techniques, that are used. Following each listed instrument, please rate the utility of the instrument for your purposes using the following 4-point scale:

1 = not useful
2 = little usefulness
3 = moderately useful
4 = highly useful

Following the utility rating, please check all the types of uses that are made of the results.

USES

1. General Ability/Intelligence Tests (e.g., WAIS-R, WISC-R, Slosson)

   a.

   b.

   c.

2. Special Aptitude Tests (e.g., Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test, Minnesota Clerical Test)

   a.

   b.

   c.

USES

3. Vocational Skills (e.g., Valpar Component Work Sample Series, McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System, Prevocational Assessment/ Curriculum Guide [PACG])

   a.

   b.

   c.

4. Academic Achievement Tests (e.g., Wide Range Achievement Test, GED)

   a.

   b.

   c.

5. Language Test (e.g., Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test)

   a.

   b.

   c.

6. Adaptive Behavior Measures (e.g., AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scales, Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales)

   a.

   b.

   c.

USES

7. Social Skills (e.g., Social Prevocational Information Battery)

   a.

   b.

   c.

8. Career Interest Inventories (e.g., Wide Range Interest and Opinion Test, Becker Reading-Free Vocational Interest Inventory)

   a.

   b.

   c.

9. Survival Skills Tests (e.g.,, Street Survival Skills)

   a.

   b.

   c.

10. Daily Living Skills (e.g., Test of Everyday Living)

   a.

   b.

   c.

USES

11. Dexterity (e.g., Purdue Pegboard Dexterity Test, Crawford Small Parts Test)

    a.

    b.

    c.

12. Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction (e.g., Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale)

    a.

    b.

    c.

13. Other

    a.

    b.

    c.

14. What are your major dissatisfactions with available measurement procedures for each of the following purposes?

    a. initial assessment for placement

    b. assessment for program planning

    c. assessment during the training program

    d. assessment for evaluation (outcome measures)

15. What client information do employers find most useful?

16. What student information do educators in your program find most useful?

17. Are you interested in obtaining a summary of the measurement procedures being developed by other projects?

18. How can the Institute be of greatest use to you in dealing with questions of student assessment?

19. Please enclose any copies of locally developed instruments and any reports that include discussions of your assessment procedures or data that have been collected using either locally developed or commercially available measures.

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire.

APPENDIX B

REVIEW OF COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

List of Test Reviews

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. ACT Assessment	AC,CI	65
. AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale - Revised	AB	67
. APTICOM	VOC	69
. Aptitude Tests for Occupations (ATO)	VOC	70
. Assessment of Independent Living Skills (AILS)	AB,DL	71
. Bankson Language Screening Test (BLST)	LA	72
. Becker Reading-Free Interest Inventory (R-FVII)	CI	73
. Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test	MO	75
. Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test	SA,MO	76
. Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test (BMCT)	SA	77
. Bloomer-Learning Test	O	78
. Botel Reading Inventory (BRI) Word Opposites	LA,AC	79
. Brief Psychiatric Rating Test Scale	O	81
. Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills	AC,AB,DL,SS	83
. California Achievement Test (CAT)	AC	85
. California Occupational Preference System (COPS)	CI	87
. Canfield Learning Styles Inventory	O	89
. Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS)	CI	90
. Career Assessment Inventory (CAI)	CI	91
. Career Development Inventory (CDI)	CI	93
. Career Maturity Inventory (CMI)	CI	95

GA-General Ability/ Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/ Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/ Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. Career Orientation Placement and Evaluation Survey (COPES)	CI	97
. Carrow Elicited Language Inventory (CELI)	LA	99
. CHOICE	CI	102
. Choosing a Major at Penn State	CI	103
. Clinical Evaluation of Language Function (CELF)	LA	104
. Comprehensive Occupational Assessment and Training System (COATS)	VOC	106
. Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS)	AC	108
. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory	O	109
. Coping Mastery Scale	O	111
. Crawford Small Parts Dexterity Test	SA,MO	112
. Daly-Miller Scale of Writing Apprehension	AC	113
. Defense Mechanism Inventory (DMI)	O	115
. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA-2)	GA	117
. Differential Aptitude Test (DAT)	SA	118
. Elwyn Remedial Inventory One	AB	120
. English Language Skills Assessment (ELSA)	LA	121
. Family-Burden Questionnaire	O	122
. Forer Vocational Survey	VOC	124
. Functional Assessment Inventory (FAI)	O	125
. Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B)	SOC	126
. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension/Vocabulary	AC,LA	127
. Geist Picture Interest Inventory	CI	129

GA-General Ability/Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)	GA	130
. General Clerical Test	SA	132
. Global Assessment Scale (GAS)	O	134
. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination	LA	136
. Gordon Occupational Checklist	CI	138
. Hall Occupational Orientation Inventory (HOOI)	CI	140
. Harrington O'Shea System for Career Decision Making	CI	142
. Holland Self-Directed Search	CI	144
. Home Activities Interview (HA)	AB,LS	145
. Interest Determination Exploration Assessment System (IDEAS)	CI	147
. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)	AC	148
. Janis-Fields Feeling of Inadequacy Scale	O,LS	149
. Jewish Employment and Vocational Service Work Sample System (JEVS)	VOC	150
. Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC)	GA	152
. Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (K-TEA)	AC	154
. KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test	AC	156
. Knowledge of the World of Work Scale	CI	158
. Kolb Learning Styles Inventory	O	160
. Kuder Preference Record - Vocational	CI	162
. Leisure Interest Survey	LS	164
. Leisure Time Activities Scale	DL,LS	165

GA-General Ability/ Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/ Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/ Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. Leiter Intelligence Scale (LIS)	GA	167
. Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale	LS	168
. McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System	VOC	169
. McCarron Prevocational Assessment	VOC	171
. Microcomputer Evaluation Screening Assessment (MESA)	VOC	172
. Micro-TOWER	VOC	173
. Minnesota Clerical Test	SA	175
. Minnesota Occupational Importance Questionnaire	CI	177
. Minnesota Paper Form Board Test-Revised	SA	179
. Minnesota Rate of Manipulation	SA,MO	180
. Minnesota Spatial Relations Test	SA	181
. Modern Language Aptitude Test	SA	183
. Nagi Index of Disability	AB,DL	185
. Nelson-Denny Reading Skills Test	AC	187
. Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control	O	189
. Occupational Attitude Survey and Interest Scale (OASIS-A)	CI	191
. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	AC	192
. Peabody Picture Vocabulary-Revised (PPVT-R)	LA	194
. Pennsylvania Bimanual Dexterity Work Sample	SA,MO	196
. Personnel Tests for Industry (PTI)	VO	197
. Pictorial Inventory of Careers	CI	198

GA-General Ability/ Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/ Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/ Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale	O	199
. Preschool Language Scale (PLS)	LA	201
. Prevocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (PACG)	VOC	203
. Purdue Pegboard	SA,MO	205
. Raven Standard Progressive Matrices	GA	206
. Reading for Understanding Placement Test (RFU)	AC	208
. Revised Beta Examination - Second Edition (Beta-II)	GA	209
. Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank	O	211
. San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale (SFVCS)	VOC	213
. Scales of Independent Behavior (SIB)	AB	214
. Singer Vocational Evaluation System (VES)	VOC	216
. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)	O	218
. Slingerland Screening Test	LA	220
. Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT)	GA	222
. Social Network Checklist	DL, SOC	224
. Social Performance Survey Schedule	SOC	226
. Social and Prevocational Information Battery (SPIB) (SP, B-T)	SOC,VOC	228
. SRA Computer Operation Aptitude Battery	SA	230
. SRA Reading - Arithmetic Index	AC	232
. SRA Verbal Form	LA,AC	234
. Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)	AC	236
. Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale-Fourth Edition	GA	238

GA-General Ability/ Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/ Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/ Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. Stanford Diagnostic-Reading Test (SDRT)	LA,AC	239
. Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK)	AC	241
. Street Survival Skills Questionnaire (SSSQ)	SS	243
. Stromberg Dexterity Test	SA,MO	245
. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	CI	246
. Talent Assessment Program (TAP)	VOC	248
. Temperament and Values Inventory (TVI)	O	250
. Test of Adolescent Language (TOAL)	LA	251
. Test for Everyday Living Skills (TEL)	DL,AB,SS	253
. Test of Interpersonal Competency for Employment (TICE)	SOC	255
. Test of Language Development-Intermediate (TOLD-I)	LA	256
. Test of Written Language (TOWL)	LA,AC	258
. Testing, Orientation, and Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation (TOWER)	VOC	260
. Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	AC	262
. Tests of General Educational Development (GED)	AC	264
. U.S. Employment Service Interest Inventory	CI	266
. VALPAR Component Work Sample System	VOC	268
. Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales - Revised	AB,DL,SOC,LA,MO	270
. Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (VACG)	VOC	272
. Vocational Information and Evaluation Work Samples (VIEWS)	VOC	274

GA-General Ability/ Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills

AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/ Awareness

MO-Motor Skills/ Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

Test	Competencies Assessed	Page
. Vocational Interest, Temperament & Aptitude System (VITAS)	VOC,CI	276
. Waksman Social Skills Rating Form	SOC	278
. Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist	O	280
. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (WAIS-R)	GA	281
. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R)	GA	282
. Weller-Strawscr Scales of Adaptive Behavior	AB	284
. Wide Range Achievement Test - Revised (WRAT)	AC	286
. Wide Range Employability Sample Test (WREST)	VOC	288
. Wide Range Interest and Opinion Test (WRIOT)	CI	290
. Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-educational Battery	GA,AC	292
. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (WRMT)	LA,AC	295

GA-General Ability/Intelligence
SA-Special Ability
VOC-Vocational Skills
AC-Academic Skills
LA-Language Skills
AB-Adaptive Behavior
SOC-Social Skills
DL-Daily Living Skills
SS-Survival Skills
CI-Career Interest/Awareness
MO-Motor Skills/Dexterity
LS-Lifestyle/Consumer Satisfaction
O-Other

As was indicated in the body of this report, the OSERS-funded secondary transition projects make use of a wide variety of commercially available measures of student competencies. These measures vary in terms of many characteristics, including the competencies they are intended to measure, the difficulty of administration, the appropriate uses of the instruments, their cost, and their psychometric characteristics.

The choice of appropriate measures for particular purposes is always a challenging task. This is particularly true when trying to identify measures for students with special needs that will assist in meeting expanded goals such as those of the secondary transition projects. There are literally thousands of published and unpublished instruments from which to choose. Tests in Print III (Mitchell, 1983), for example, lists 2,672 published tests, and The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Mitchell, 1985) includes 1,266 reviews of 790 different tests. The majority of the tests reviewed in the latter publication were either new or revised since 1978 when the Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Buros, 1978) appeared, although older, frequently cited tests are also listed and sometimes reviewed.

The current and previous editions of the Mental Measurements Yearbook are an excellent source of information about tests. They contain routine information about the list, publisher, the scores provided, administration time, and a description of the groups with which the tests is intended to be used. They also contain a comprehensive listing of published references concerning the test in addition to critical reviews by one or more reviewers.

Although the collective editions of The Mental Measurements Yearbook are probably the best single collection of information about a wide range of tests, it must be recognized that they are intended to serve many different audiences. Consequently, reviews that may provide excellent guidance for some potential users may fail to include crucial information for someone who is interested in locating a test for a particular purpose and a given group of students. In particular, reviews rarely address the issue of test use with special populations or the kinds of adaptations and alternative administration conditions that may be needed for use of a measure with students with various handicapping conditions. Similarly, the relevance of the norms and the evidence of reliability and validity for students with special needs are only rarely considered.

The results of the survey of test uses by OSERS-funded projects provides a listing of instruments that are obviously judged to be appropriate for at least some of the measurement needs with groups of students who are the focus of the secondary transition effort. Hence, it was thought that the list provided by the projects would make a good beginning for the development of a compendium of measures relevant to transition.

The reviews that follow are just that, a beginning. It is not anticipated that this initial version will be as inclusive as may eventually be desired. Nor is it anticipated that it will serve as a substitute for other sources such as the Mental Measurements Yearbooks or, more important, detailed test manuals and publications pertaining to the use of specific instruments. However, it is hoped that the following reviews will provide project staff with a readily accessible source of information to aid in initial screening of potential instruments as well as an indication of additional sources of information about each instrument.

The reviews are organized according to the following outline:

Name of instrument
Publisher's name and address
Cost
Date of publication
Competencies assessed
Population characteristics
Recommended uses
Test content and format
Administration time
Skills/materials required
Derived scores/information
Norming/standardization practices
Reliability
Validity
Comments
References

Although most of these entries are self-explanatory, a few deserve some comment. Under population characteristics, special attention was given to any information in the test manual indicating previous use with students with particular handicapping conditions. The recommended uses are those that are provided by the test publisher. In the norming, reliability, and validity sections, information relevant to use of the instrument with students with special needs and handicapping conditions was emphasized when available in the publishers' materials. The comments section contains brief summary and evaluative statements regarding the instrument and its potential use in secondary/transition settings.

Finally, only a few carefully selected references that are judged to be particularly pertinent in the context of transition are listed.

As alluded to above, the reviews are intended as an initial effort to develop a compendium of information about assessment instruments with potential utility to transition projects. Future revisions and expansions of these reviews will depend, in part, on the nature of the use they receive and the reactions of secondary/transition projects staff. Reactions and suggestions for making the set of reviews more useful are welcome.

References

Buros, O. K. (1978). The eighth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.

Mitchell, J. V., Jr. (1983). Tests in print III. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Mitchell, J. V., Jr. (1985). The ninth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

ACT Assessment
(formerly called ACT Test Battery)

Publisher: The American College Testing Program
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52240

Cost: Examination fee - $7.50/candidate: fee includes reporting of scores to candidate, high school, and 3 colleges; $1.00/manual for ACT interest inventory.

Date of Publication: 1959-77

Competencies Assessed: Academic test: 5 scores - English usage, mathematics usage, social studies reading, natural sciences reading, composite. ACT interest inventory: 6 scores - science, creative arts, social service, business contact, business detail, technical.

Population Characteristics: Candidates for college entrance; special editions available for administration to the handicapped.

Recommended Uses: Predictable grade indices for English, mathematics, social sciences, natural sciences, and for overall grade point average of each prospective student based on weighted combinations of his ACT scores only are provided to colleges. In addition, another five predictive indices are also reported based on weighted combinations of the student's ACT scores and junior year high school course grades in the same areas. The test is not designed for differential prediction or advanced placement.

Test Content and Format: 4 parts; academic tests administered 5 times a year (February, April, June, October, November, or December) on Saturdays at centers established by the publisher; ACT interest inventory and student profile section completed locally as part of registration for the academic tests. Within two to four weeks after each testing date, reports of scores are sent to each of three colleges designated by the student; within three to four weeks, two reports are sent to the student's high school, one for the school and one for the student. Multiple choice test format.

Administration Time: 160 (210) min. total (English usage test - 50 min., Mathematics Usage Test - 50 min., Social Studies Reading Test - 40 min., Natural Science Reading Test - 40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Supervisor's manual; counselor's handbook; registration procedures (includes interest inventory and student profile section); registration folder; technical report; highlights of technical report; norms; interpretive booklet; using ACT on campus.

Derived Scores/Information: Local and national percentile equivalents are provided for ACT standard scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Raw scores of ACT tests are equated to corresponding standard scores of the Iowa Test of Educational

Development whose scale for all four high school grades in the Iowa high school population originally had mean 16 (the mean for college-bound seniors was about 20) and standard deviation 5. National ACT percentile rank norms for students are reported for seniors actually taking the ACT test. Many sets of norms for individual colleges, regions, type of school, etc. have been developed.

Reliability: Odd-even reliability coefficients of the four subtests of Form 4-AC obtained for a sample of 990 high school seniors are .90, .89, .86, and .83 for English, mathematics, social studies and natural sciences, respectively. The reliability of the composite standard score is .95. In standard score units, the corresponding standard errors of measurement are respectively, 1.54, 2.13, 2.15, 2.45, and 1.03. Intercorrelations of the four tests based on the same data are as follows: English and mathematics, .53; English and social studies, .63; English and natural sciences, .58; mathematics and social studies, .55; mathematics and natural sciences, .64; social studies and natural sciences, .68.

Validity: Validation of the ACT has been very extensive with good results. It is estimated that the central tendency of the distribution of correlations between ACT composite scores and overall grade point averages is about .50. The most crucial characteristic of this test, its predictive validity, proves to be satisfactory.

Comments: Considered to provide a broader coverage of educational skills than do most other tests of scholastic aptitude. Further studies of alternate form reliability are needed.

American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD)
Adaptive Behavior Scale
1975-Regular Edition   1981-Public School Edition

Publisher: American Association on Mental Deficiency
5201 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20015

Cost:	$5.00/manual	$1.00/test
	$6.00/specimen set	10% extra for postage

Date of Publication: 1975-ABS; 1981-Public School Edition

Competencies Assessed: Degree of personal independence/maladaptive behaviors.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded and emotionally maladjusted persons, ages 3-adult.

Recommended Uses: Placement, programming, instruction, training.

Test Content and Format: PART I: Measures skills/behaviors related to personal independence; PART II: Maladaptive behavior. Interview format. Interviewees may be teacher or parent. Child may be performance appraised in some instances. Interviewer marks and scores answer booklet. Types of responses are of two types: (1) Highest level of competence in Part I, and (2) "Frequently," "Never," "Occasionally" in Part II indicates frequency of maladaptive behavior.

Administration Time: 30-120 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Administration, booklet, score sheet, profile.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores are marked and scored by interviewer. Raw scores converted to percentiles on one profile. Raw scores converted to scaled scores on second profile. Both utilize graphical display and scores are based on age equivalents.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Percentile norms for regular edition based on 4,000 M.R. persons; Public School Version norms based on 2,600 subjects in grades 2-6 (both regular and special edition and different ethnic groups). Caution indicated because certain ages do not have adequate sample of population.

Reliability: Interrater reliability for 10 domains in Part I range from .71 to .93, M = .86. Part II = .37-.77, M = .67.

Validity: Manual reports good descriptive, high face validity, but presents little evidence.

Comments: Items, subdomains, or domain scores can be used independently, can evaluate student status and progress.

References:

Carsrud, A. L., Carsrud, K. B., Dodd, B. G., Thompson, M., & Gray, W. K. (1981). Predicting vocational aptitude of mentally retarded persons: A comparison of assessment systems. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, *86*(3), 275-280.

Lambert, N. M. (1979). Contributions of school classification, sex, and ethnic status to adaptive behavior assessment. *Journal of School Psychology*, *8*, 281-283.

Nihira, K., Foster, R., Shellhaas, M., & Leland, H. (1981). *AAMD adaptive behavior scale* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Deficiencies.

APTICOM

Publisher: Vocational Research Institute
Department 1047
2100 Arch St.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Cost: MINI - $6,000, 1 printer and 1 apticom; MIDI - $12,400, 2 printers, 1 master control, 2 apticoms; MAXI - $22,300, 4 printers, 1 master control, 4 apticoms

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: Vocational aptitudes and interests as well as work related language and math skills.

Population Characteristics: Handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Recommended Uses: As an aid to placement in the vocational setting.

Test Content and Format: The Apticom consists of a battery of 11 aptitude tests, an interest inventory, and work-related language and math tests. The test is self-administered using a special computer.

Administration Time: 90 min.

Skills/Materials Required: A desktop-computer (APTICOM) and printer. The test is totally self-scoring and self-timing, and the report is generated automatically.

Derived Scores/Information: Computer printout with aptitude interest and educational development profiles. Standard scores, percentile scores and vocational recommendations are also included based on the U.S. Department of Labor *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: The manual reports that results are "consistently reliable," but little supporting evidence is provided.

Validity: Apticom has been validated against the U.S. Department of Labor's own general aptitude battery, the GATB and the USES Interest Inventory.

Reference:

Field, T. F., & Orgar, W. (1983). *Measuring worker traits*. Athens, GA: VDARE Service Bureau.

Aptitude Tests for Occupations (ATO)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oaks Blvd.
Austin, TX 78735

Cost: $13-$18

Date of Publication: 1951

Competencies Assessed: Aptitudes and potentials related to occupations and careers, in high school students, college students, and adults.

Population Characteristics: High school-Adult

Recommended Uses: Occupational Guidance and Counseling

Test Content and Format: Six paper-pencil aptitude tests, each of which may be given independently. Tests: Personal/Social (Test 1), Mechanical (Test 2), General Sales (Test 3), Clerical Routine (Test 4), Computation (Test 5), and Scientific (Test 6).

Administration Time: 1 hour, 17 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Student booklet, examiner's manual, key, examiner required.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw score is number of right answers minus 1/3 of wrong answers. Raw score converted to percentile. Total possible points is 45.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Test scores of over 7000 students in grades 9-13 were used for standardization, tests were administered in school districts of various sizes and types in 20 different states in the United States. Consisted of eight regions: N. England States, Middle Atlantic, Deep South, Upper Midwest, Lower Midwest, Southwest, Northwest, and California. Percentile norms provides means of comparison between students of same grade groups.

Reliability: Kuder-Richardson tests-retest range between high 70's to low 90's for all grades and tests. Average mean is 20 (clerical excepted) with average S.D. = 8.4.

Validity: Intercorrelation data based on 250 cases selected at random in grades 9-13. Clerical excepted because it is a speed test. Mean scores for tests ranged from 12.4-24.00, S.D. = 7.0-13.1, Reliabilities with batteries r = .74-.92. Correlated to school marks r = .50.

Reference:

Roeder, Wesley. (1951). Aptitude tests for occupations. Austin, TX: PRO-ED Publishers.

Assessment of Independent Living Skills (AILS)

Publisher: Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
University of North Carolina--Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223

Cost: Yet to be determined.

Date of Publication: 1985 (in developmental progress)

Competencies Assessed: Socialization, public behavior, personal grooming, time/money, use of transportation, use of community resources/information, and use of leisure time.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded and developmentally disabled adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: Assessment, teaching, measurement of student progress.

Test Content and Format: Assess seven skill areas considered necessary for independent functioning using an interview with a knowledgeable respondent.

Administration Time: 60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Respondent (parent, surrogate), interviewer, test, answer sheet.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 60 Mentally retarded clients (18-66 yrs of age), 32 - Males, 28 - Females participated in the standardization.

Reliability: Authors claim that reliability studies document that the test is reliable, but little supporting evidence is provided.

Validity: Correlation between AILS and AAMD range from .77 to .92.

Reference:

Keul, P., Heller, H. W., Grossi, T., Spooner, F., & Test, D. (in progress). *Assessment of independent living skills (AILS)*. Charlotte: University of North Carolina.

Bankson Language Screening Test (BLST)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oaks Boulevard
Austin, TX 78735

Cost: $32

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Psycholinguistic and perceptual skills.

Population Characteristics: Children 4-7 yrs.

Recommended Uses: Intervention and remediation.

Test Content and Format: Consists of 17 nine-item subtests and is organized into five general categories which assesses a variety of areas: Semantic Knowledge - body parts, nouns, verbs, categories, functions; Morphological Rules - pronouns, verb tenses, plurals, etc.; Syntactic Rules - subject-verb, negation, sentence repetition, etc.; Visual Perception - matching, discrimination, association, sequencing; and Auditory Perception - memory, sequencing, discrimination.

Administration Time: 30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Examiner's manual and scoring sheets.

Derived Scores/Information: Reported in terms of percentile ranks.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Consisted of more than 600 children living in counties adjacent to the Washington, D.C. area.

Reliability: Test-retest and internal consistency, coefficients exceed .90.

Validity: Correlates with Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (r = .54), the Boehm Concept Test (r = .62), and the Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language (r = .64).

Reference:

Bankson, N. (1977). Bankson language screening test. Austin, TX: PRO-ED Publishing Company.

Becker Reading-Free Vocational Interest Inventory (R-FVII)

Publisher: American Association on Mental Deficiency
5201 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20015

Cost: Specimen set $17.60; male or female inventory booklet $1.35.

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: Vocational preferences/interest/

Population Characteristics: Non-readers, particularly the educable mentally retarded at the high school level.

Recommended Uses: Training, counseling, career guidance in unskilled and semi-skilled levels.

Test Content and Format: Illustrations have occupational significance presented in forced-choice patterns for selection. The inventory provides (unskilled and skilled) scores in eleven male and eight female areas. Areas include automotive, building trades, clerical, animal care, etc. Non- reading feature requires no verbal or written statements by examinees. Total of 165 (55 triads) male items and 120 (40 triads) female items. Examinee selects the preferred activity. Oral administration.

Administration Time: 20 min. or less to administer; 20 min. to score.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, male inventory, female inventory.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores, percentile ranks, T-scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Educably mentally retarded students, grades 9-12 in secondary and ungraded residential institutions across the U.S. (3407 males and 3006 females) participated in the standardization.

Reliability: Test-retest (two week interval) .71 and .81; standard errors of measurement range from .10-2.3 and are greater than 1.9 in only four cases. K-R 20 reliabilities range from .67-.96 with medians ranging from .79-.82 for various samples.

Validity: Predictive validity is yet to be established. Content validity based on the way in which job task items were derived and their discrimination power between lower and upper levels. Correlations with Geist Picture Inventory .06-.78; correlations with Picture Interest Inventory (males only) = .03-.82.

Comments: Validity data are adequate only for certain groups and certain scales. Inventory should be used with caution for decision making. Exploratory in nature.

Reference:

Becker, R. L. (1975). Becker free-reading vocational interest inventory. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test

Publisher: American Guidance Service
Publishers Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Date of Publication: 1938

Competencies Assessed: Level of perceptual motor development which is intended to parallel cognitive development.

Population Characteristics: Children and adults.

Recommended Uses: Clinical assessment of specific handicapping conditions; screening for problems of perceptual motor integration; and as part of a comprehensive diagnostic battery.

Test Content and Format: The Bender is administered by asking the individual to copy, on a blank sheet of paper, the abstract designs on each of the nine test cards.

Administration Time: The test is untimed, but average administration is 6-8 minutes.

Skills/Materials Required: 9 test cards; blank paper, pencil, administration guide in manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Several scoring systems are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: A scoring system for use with children, developed by Elizabeth M. Koppitz, is based on a 1974 standardization that included a representative sample of children aged 5-11 years, drawn from rural-urban communities and including 14% minority children. A scoring system for older children and adults, developed by Gerald E. Pascal and Barbara J. Suttell, is standardized on a sample including high school students, college students, and adults, ages 15-50.

Reliability: Varies depending on scoring system used.

Validity: Several studies have examined the utility of the Bender for differentiating between normal and handicapped populations and for determining developmental level.

Comments: Although the Bender is widely used in the identification of specific learning disabilities, its usefulness in the transition process is not clear.

Reference:

Bender, L. A. (1938). *A visual motor Gestalt test and its clinical use*. New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association.

Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test

Publisher: The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Date of Publication: 1965

Competencies Assessed: Proficiency in using ordinary mechanics' tools based on aptitude and past experience.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: To assess proficiency at this isolated motor task.

Test Content and Format: Test apparatus is mounted on work bench. Examinee removes a series of bolts from one side to the other.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test apparatus, work bench, stopwatch.

Derived Scores/Information: Score is the time taken to do the task. Norms are provided which allow comparison with 8 occupation groups.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: The task that the examinee is required to do has little similarity to actual job requisites.

Reference:

Bennett, G. K. (1965). Hand tool dexterity test. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test (BMCT)

Publisher:
Psychological Corp.
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $6.50/25 tests; $3.50/50 answer sheets; $.50/key; $7.50/3 3/4 ips tape; $.50 manual; $1.00 specimen set; postage extra

Date of Publication: 1968

Competencies Assessed: Measures the ability to perceive and understand the relationship of physical forces and mechanical elements in practical situations.

Population Characteristics: 9-12 grades and adults

Recommended Uses: Educational and vocational guidance

Test Content and Format: Forms S and T (for men in engineering schools). Content is principally pictures of mechanisms whose functions call for comprehension, for example, a spread-eagled stepladder and a closed one - "Which stepladder is safer to climb on?" 68 questions in each form.

Administration Time: 30-35 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: Test, answer sheet, tape, administration, guide, pencil, eraser

Derived Scores/Information: Scores are based on number of correct responses. Percentile norms are available for a variety of groups

Norming/Standardization Practices: Percentile norms for 6 industrial groups N=100-906; four student groups (grade 11, 12 in academic and tech. schools in one city) N=85-254

Reliability: Difficulty ranges .16-.96, point-biserial correlations .20-.51; odd-even reliabilities .81-.93, median .86

Validity: Five validity quotients .12-.52, median .24. Low correlations with several other tests, i.e., revised Minn. Paper Form Board Test (.40-.60), Bennett Hand-Tool (.30-.40) Minnesota Clerical (close to 0).

References:

Bennett, G., & Owens, W. (1940). Bennett mechanical comprehension test. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Grant, D., & Bray, D. (1970). Validation of employment tests for telephone company installation and repair occupations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54(1), 7-14.

Bloomer Learning Test (BLT)

Publishers: Brador Publications, Inc.
Education Division
Scotland, Connecticut 06264

Cost: $78.00

Date of Publication: 1978-1981

Competencies Assessed: Determines strengths and weaknesses in learning patterns of individual pupils.

Population Characteristics: Grades 1.5-11+; Learning disabled emotionally disturbed, and gifted, as well as normal students.

Recommended Uses: Planning remedial or compensatory educational programs.

Test Content and Format: Ten paper-pencil subtests: activity, visual and auditory short-term memory, visual apprehension, serial learning, recall, relearning, recall, relearning, association, paired associate learning, concept recognition and production, and problem solving. Examiner required and suitable for group use.

Administration Time: Approximately 90 minutes.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, test stimuli, answer forms, record forms, scoring key.

Derived Scores/Information: Learning profile is developed.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample included 2,000 children in N.E. from 87 school districts by grade level rather than age. Norms are for entire test and not subtests.

Reliability: Subscores .89 - .97, Subtests by grade level .94 - .97.

Validity: Construct validity is supported by correlational analysis with the WAIS-R, WRAT, and the Stanford Test of Academic Skills.

References:

Bloomer, R. (1978). Bloomer Learning Test. Scotland, CT.: Brador Publications, Inc.

Botel Reading Inventory (BRI) - Word Opposites Test

Publisher: Follett Publishing Co.
1010 W. Washington Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60607

Cost: (1985) $8.00/manual; $6.58 for 35 Word Opposites Test (Form A or B)

Date of Publication: 1961-70

Competencies Assessed: Measures students' current reading performance level. Frustrational, instructional (placement), and free reading grade levels for a vocabulary test; additional BRI tests are available in the following areas: Word Recognition Test (Grades 1-4); Phonics Mastery Test (Grades 1-4); Spelling Placement Test (Grades 1-6)

Population Characteristics: Grades 1-12

Recommended Uses: A vocabulary test described as an estimate of silent reading comprehension. Author states that the test may also be used in grades 3-12 as a listening test to determine "reading potential." It was not designed to be an all-inclusive comprehension test.

Test Content and Format: 10 "graded" scaled 10-word lists described as samples of reading materials at 10 levels (1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4, 5, 6, 7-8, 9-12); 3 grade scores: frustration level (0-60%), instructional level (70%-80%), free reading level (90-100%). Each item consists of 4 or 5 words, and child is asked to find a word in each line that is the opposite of the first word. Group administration.

Administration Time: Untimed. Length of time varies.

Skills/Materials Required: Forms A and B for pre- and post-testing, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Derived scores not available. Raw scores are converted into frustrational, instructional, and free reading level scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: Reliability measures are not reported in manual. Correlations between forms A and B of the BRI are reported in the form of placement scores and raw scores for Grades 1-6 with a range of .99 to .66.

Validity: Content, criterion-related, and concurrent validity are reported. Two studies were undertaken in 1969 and 1970 with small samples in schools in Pennsylvania. In the first test the Word Opposites Test and a standardized reading test (title not mentioned) were administered followed by the placement of pupils in the Ginn basal readers. Results in the areas of raw scores, test scores, and means were relatively equal between the BRI and the standardized test. In the second test, a stratified, randomly selected group of 30 pupils in a Philadelphia school were placed at their instructional level in an informal reading inventory prepared for Scott, Foresman basal readers. Then results on this inventory were compared with Form A of the Botel Reading Inventory, Spache's Diagnostic Reading Scales, and McCracken's Standard Reading Inventory. Comparisons in placement levels were made with wide variation in results.

Comments: Because there are no normative data, no norms or standardization practices, and no data on reliability or validity, it may be considered questionable how this test would be better than a simple application of informal reading inventory criteria to the oral and silent reading of graded material. BRI also has available the Word Recognition Test under this test title name.

References:

Botel, Morton. (1969). A comparative study of the validity of the Botel reading inventory and selected standardized tests. Prac. Ann. Carr. Int. Read Ass., 13(1), 721-727.

Botel, M., Bradley, J., & Kashuba, M. (1970). The validity of informal reading testing, pp. 85-103. In Reading difficulties: diagnosis, correction, and remediation. Edited by W. K. Durr. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 276.

Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale

Publisher: U. S. Printing Office
Grant MYP-5144
National Institute of Mental Health
Washington, D.C.

Cost: Public domain

Date of Publication: 1962

Competencies Assessed: Patient progress and change in major symptom characteristics.

Population Characteristics: Emotionally disturbed individuals/adults.

Recommended Uses: Monitoring progress.

Test Content and Format: Sixteen symptom constructs resulting from factor analyses of several larger sets of items, principally Lorr's Multidimensional Scale for Rating Psychiatric Patients (MRSPP) (1953) and Inpatient Multidimensional Psychiatric Scale (IMPS) (1960) have been included. A Likert-type rating scale representing "Not Present" to "Extremely Severe" is used for rating. This scale should be used in conjunction with standard interview procedure.

Administration Time: 18 min. (3 min. = establishing, rapport, 10 min. = non-directive interaction, 5 min. = direct questioning)

Skills/Materials Required: Form, interviewer

Derived Scores/Information: Scoring of ratings is accomplished by assigning equal interval values (1,2,3, and so on) to the rating categories. Total score is the sum. Pathologies are weighted based on psychiatric consensual ratings. Scores for pathologies are obtained by multiplying the rating times the weight of the pathology.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Authors recommended standardization of local procedures and consensual understanding of rating constructs. Standardization is accomplished through interrater reliability and resolution of interpretation differences. Differences in interview technique must also be considered, as well as interview setting.

Reliability: Interrater Reliability (N=112 Homogeneous schizophrenics) ranged from .52-.90 = .77, (N=83 newly admitted schizophrenics); ranged from .56-.87, m = .78. These reliabilities represent combined ratings of two independent raters.

Validity: Construct validity is based interrater reliability and local standardization, as well as on agreement between observation of patient and verbal report. Constructs based on multivariate analysis.

References:

Overall, J., & Gorham, D. (1962). The brief psychiatric rating scale. Psychological Reports, 10, 799-812.

Overall, J. E. (1974) Validity of the Psychological Screening Inventory for psychiatric screening. Journal of Consult and Clinical Psychology, 42, 717-719.

Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills

Publisher: Curriculum Associates, Inc.
North Bellerica, MA 01862

Cost: (1983) $99.95 for examiner's tests & 10 student record books, $16.95 for 10 record books; free preview excerpts are available.

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Reading (word recognition, grade placement, oral reading, reading comp, function word recognition, word analysis), language arts (reference skills, schedules and graphs, writing, forms, spelling), mathematics (grade placement, numbers, number facts, computation, fractions, decimals, percents, measurement, metrics, math vocabulary), life skills (health and safety, vocational, money and finance, travel and transport, food and clothing, oral communication and telephone.

Population Characteristics: Grades 4-12, primarily for individuals who have minimum survival skills as their educational goal, special needs students.

Recommended Uses: Useful as part of an IEP when the students' education is focused on acquiring basic skills. The broad scope of the test also enables educators to select certain areas relevant to the student in question.

Test Content and Format: 191 tests in four broad areas, some require that the tester know the individual. Well designed to assess the basic skills required for successful functioning as an adult.

Administration Time: Some tests are timed, others have no time limit -- cannot be used as part of a single assessment session, overall administration time is many hours.

Skills/Materials Required: Response booklet, teachers manual, tests, for some sections the instructor is required to know the student well.

Derived Scores/Information: Manual provides suggestions for use, IEP objectives, and references.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Lacks any kind of national norms.

Reliability. No data available.

Validity: High content validity, most questionable were those requiring the party rate skills-however this is acknowledged by the author.

Comments: Criterion referenced, emphasizes the importance of local expectations and standards are more important than grade levels described in the manual.

References:

Brigance, A. (1981). Brigance diagnostic inventory of essential skills. Newton, MA: Curriculum Associates Inc.

Mitchell, J. V. (Ed.). (1985). Mental measurements yearbook, 1, 221-223.

California Achievement Test (CAT), 1970 Edition

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Cost: (1985) $19.50/multi-level examination kit, $10.35/specimen set (specify primary, intermediate, or secondary), separate answer sheets (CompuScan, Digitek, IBM 230, Scoreze) must be used in grades 4-12, postage extra

Date of Publication: 1974

Competencies Assessed: Assesses achievement in basic academic skills: reading (vocabulary, comprehension, total), mathematics (computation, concepts and problems, total), language (mechanics, usage and structure, total, spelling), total; subtests in reading, mathematics, and language available as separates.

Population Characteristics: Grades 1.5-12

Recommended Uses: Designed for measuring, evaluating, and analyzing school achievement in terms of student performance in the basic curricular content areas of reading, mathematics, and language.

Test Content and Format: 11 or 12 scores. Measures the three R's only, with an integrated series running from grade 1 through 12. The CATs five levels (Grades 1.5-2, 2-4, 4-6, 6-9, 9-12) provide for deliberate overlap at grades 2, 4, 6, and 9. Multiple item paper-pencil test. Group administration.

Administration Time: Level 1 (Grades 1.5-2) - 171 minutes in 3 sessions; Level 2 (Grades 2-4) - 177 minutes in 3 sessions; Level 3 (Grades 4-6) 212 minutes in 3 sessions; Level 4 (Grades 6-9) - 198 minutes in 3 sessions; Level 5 (Grades 9-12) - 207 minutes in 3 sessions

Skills/Materials Required: Form A manual; Form B manual; scoring booklets; answer sheets; coordinator's handbook; technical report.

Derived Scores/Information: Conversion tables are provided for raw score to grade equivalent, Achievement Development Scale Score, percentile rank, and stanine. Anticipated Achievement Scale Scores also included.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The standardization process seems to be almost exemplary. A stratified probability sampling approach was used. In 1970 a nationwide sample of approximately 203,684 students were administered the CAT, which was standardized jointly with the Short Form Test of Academic Aptitude. The stratification design included seven geographic regions, three school district enrollment groups, and four community types.

Comments: Particularly useful if continuity of basic skills testing is desired over the full twelve grades of schooling. Considered a well-developed traditional achievement series. Isolated parts of the test at different grade levels have received some criticism due to inappropriate difficulty levels.

California Occupational Preference System
(CopSystem/CopSystem Inventory)

Publisher: EDITS/Educational/Industrial Testing Service
P.O. Box 7234
San Diego, CA 92107

Cost:

$4.75/25 profiles	$1.25 tech manual (postage extra)
$5.00/25 cluster charts	$6.50 specimen set

Consumable edition $8.25/25 tests
Reusable edition $9.75/25 tests
$4.75/50 answer sheets

IBM stencils $10.00
Scoring service .85 or less per test

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Measures interests, abilities, and work values relevant to occupational and career planning and guidance for students from junior high to college level.

Population Characteristics: Teen, adults, grades 7-up.

Recommended Uses: To facilitate identification of career aspirations.

Test Content and Format: The COPSystem consists of three measuring instruments which can be combined and analyzed in two distinct manners. The three tests are COPSystem Interest Inventory (COPS), the Career Orientation Placement and Evaluation Survey (COPES) and the Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS). The two methods of analysis and interpretation are the Comprehensive COPSystem and the Summary COPSystem. In the Comprehensive, all three tests are administered and interpreted on a single Comprehensive Career Planning Guide. In Summary, 3 tests administered and interpreted separately by using a self-interpretation profile and guide for each of the tests. All tests relate to the following System Career Clusters: Science, Technology, Consumer Economics, Outdoor, Business, Clerical, Communication, Arts, and Service. Examiner required. Multiple-choice on Likert scale from "like very much" to "dislike very much."

Administration Time: 30-40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Profile, occupational cluster charts, technical manual, administration.

Derived Scores/Information: Sums of Likert response are weighted (3, 2, 1, 0). Sums are converted to scale scores. These scores may be clustered for a profile; percentiles may also be used to compare to other students.

Norming/Standardization Practices: In 1975 standardization was conducted on a nationwide basis to a sample of over 7,000 boys and girls from public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

Reliability: Split-half reliability coefficients range from .86 to .95, test-retest coefficients (n=82) .77-.91.

Validity: No data available on validity. Test documentation lacks evidence of predictive and concurrent validity.

Comments: Careless interpretation could mislead students by having them explore careers not appropriate to them.

References:

Freeburg, N. F. (1970). Assessment of disadvantaged adolescents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61(3), 229-240.

Knapp, R. R., & Knapp, L. (1974). California occupational preference system. San Diego, CA: EDITS.

Lux, P. L. (1974). Evaluation of self-administration, self-scoring, and self-interpretation of the California occupational pref. survey. Master's thesis. California State University, Sacramento.

Canfield Learning Styles Inventory (CLS)

Publisher: Liberty Drawer
7970
Ann Arbor, MI 48107

Cost: $17.00

Date of Publication: 1980

Competencies Assessed: Identifies an individual's preferred learning method.

Population Characteristics: Grades 6 through adult

Recommended Uses: Identify styles of learning for program planning.

Test Content and Format: 30 item paper-pencil forced-rank inventory measuring learning needs such as interacting with others, goal setting, competition, friendly relations with instructor, independence in study, preferred mediums, and areas of interest. Suitable for group use, two forms, S-A for most adults and E for use with persons whose reading level is as low as fifth grade level. Emphasis on attitudinal and affective dimensions.

Administration Time: 15-30 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, answer sheets, profile sheets.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted to percentiles to standardized scores. Pattern of answers is used to develop profile based on clusters of scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Separate norms for males and females, 1,364 male and 1,180 female junior high school students.

Reliability: Split-half reliability for the clustered categories .96 - .99

Validity: Evidence of predicted validity is reported

References:

Canfield, A., & Lafferty, J. C. (1970). Learning Styles Inventory. Detroit, MI: Humanics Media (Liberty Drawer).

Dunn, R., DeBello, T., Brennan, P., Krimsky G. & Murrain, P. (1981). Learning style researchers define differences differently. Educational Leadership. 38, 372.

Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS)

Publisher: Bureau of Educational Measurements
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801

Cost: $11.94 plus tax

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Designed to measure abilities keyed to entry requirements for the majority of jobs in each of fourteen occupational clusters.

Population Characteristics: Grades 7-12; adult.

Recommended Uses: Career guidance and counseling

Test Content and Format: Fourteen clusters are the same as the clusters for the COPS Interest Inventory and the subtests include mechanical reasoning, spatial relations, verbal reasoning, numerical ability, language usage, word knowledge, perceptual speed and accuracy, manual speed and dexterity.

Administration Time: 50 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet and profile sheet

Derived Scores/Information: Profiles interpreted in terms of national norms and plotted in the form of stanines. Various tests may also be scored by clusters.

Norming/Standardization Practices: National sampling of intermediate high school, and community college students.

Reliability: Split-half reliability ranged from .69 to .95. Test-retest reliability ranged from .70 to .95.

Validity: Test validation conducted using GATB and Employee Aptitude Survey and Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Intercorrelation of tests on Sample of 422 10th graders, 105 8th graders, and 197 community college students: .15-.67, median = .35.

References:

Knapp, Lila, & Knapp, Robert (1979). Career ability placement survey. Emporia, KS: Bureau of Educational Measurements.

Tennyson, W., Soldahl, T., & Muller, C. (1971). The teacher's role in career development. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Career Assessment Inventory (CAI)

Publisher: NCS Interpretive Scoring Systems
4401 W. 7th St.
Minneapolis, MN 55435

Cost:

$8.00/50 test-answer sheets	scoring service	$1.90 or less/test
$5.00/manual	by publisher	$5.50 or less/15 page interp. report
postage extra	(weekly service)	
		$1.20 or less/test
		$30.00 minimum

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Evaluates career goals of high school students who want immediate, noncollege-graduate business or technical training.

Population Characteristics: "Individuals (grades 8 and over) seeking a career that does not require a 4-year/advanced college degree."

Recommended Uses: "Blue collar" inventory - recommended for selective use with noncollege bound to assist in employment decisions, vocational rehabilitation, and self-employment.

Test Content and Format: A 305-item paper-pencil test in a five-response Likert format. Covers six general occupational themes (Holland's RIASEC), 22 Basic Occupational Interest Scales, and 91 Occupational Scales. Self- administered, suitable for groups, untimed.

Administration Time: 20-35 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test profile, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores can be converted to percentages and standard scores by occupation. Graphical profile or narrative report format.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Reference group of 750 males and 750 females was used to develop standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Has been used with a wide variety of populations.

Reliability: Test-retest correlations for Basic Interest Scales range from .93 for one week interval to .77 for 6-7 year interval.

Validity: Content: Item-scale correlations generally high in the .60s and .70s; Concurrent: Data presented indicated 91 samples of a diversity of occupations obtain scores that follow a meaningful and logical distribution of a significant range; Construct: Correlates Basic Interest Scales to SCII and similar scales--generally in .70s and .80s. There is a lack of predictive validity.

References:

Johansson, C. B. (1982). Career assessment inventory. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Professional Assessment Services.

Phillips, J. S. (1978). Occupational interest inventories: An often untapped resource. Journal of Applied Psychology, 19, 36-41.

Weiser, M. A., Klimek, R. J., & Hodinko, B. (1981). Career perceptions of male prison inmates in college courses. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 19, 36-41.

Career Development Inventory (CDI)
(School Form)

Publisher: Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 North Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Cost: $33.55/25 sets of tests plus scoring service; $5.50/specimen set (postage extra).

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Assesses individual attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to vocational decisions.

Population Characteristics: Teens, grades 10-12.

Recommended Uses: Used in career counseling, planning guidance programs, evaluation of programs.

Test Content and Format: 120 Item paper-pencil test of eight dimensions of vocational decision making: career planning, world-of-work information, knowledge of preferred occupational group, career development--attitudes, career development--knowledge and skills, and career orientation total. Examiner required. Suitable for group use.

Administration Time: (55-65 min) 2 sessions (40 min. and 25 min.)

Skills/Materials Required: Examiner, manual, tests, answer sheets, scoring service.

Derived Scores/Information: CDI scale scores reported in standard score Form X = 100, S.D. = 20. Percentile tables for each scale constructed by grade and sex subgroups. Individual profile determined by percentile equivalents on the eight scales. Group profiles, e.g., class, curriculum, can be constructed by plotting percentile equivalents to group mean scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Conducted in 1982 on 5,039 students in grades 9-12 from New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Ohio, Alabama, Alaska, Oregon, and Alaska. Eastern schools were heavily represented in the standardization group. Not a representative national sample. Users encouraged to develop local norms.

Reliability: Internal consistency, combined scales range from .79-.88, M = .86; Decision-making and knowledge of preferred occupational group = .67, .60 respectively; Career planning, career exploration, and world of work = .89, .78, and .84 respectively. Data suggest stability over periods up to six months.

Validity: Consensual validation by "career" experts generally agree that items measure what they are intended to measure (content). Construct validity: Authors inform that CDI measures differences appropriate to educational, maturational, and psychological development, as well as curricular differences. Factor structure obtained by sex and grade (2 factors attitudinal and cognitive).

Comments: The new manual is well organized and easy to follow and understand.

References:

Super, D. E., Thompson, A. S., Lindeman, R. H., Jordann, J. P., & Myers, R. A. (1975). Career development inventory (school form). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Weely, M. A., & Johnson, C. W. (1981). The relationship of performance on six scales of the Career Development Inventory to sex, father's education, and father's occupation. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41, 917-921.

Career Maturity Inventory (CMI)
(formerly Vocational Development Inventory)

Publisher:
CTB/McGraw Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Cost:

Attitude: $6.65/35 tests
Competence: $18.20/35 tests (must be used)

$4.00/50 Compuscan	postage extra
5.00/50 Digitek/IBM 12.30	scoring - $50. minimum
2.51/IBM stencil	
5.00/100 profiles	
2.50/handbook	
5.00/specimen	

Date of Publication: 1973

Competencies Assessed: Career attitude and competence in making career decisions.

Population Characteristics: Grades 6-12 and adults.

Recommended Uses: Screening individuals for counseling, evaluation outcomes of career education, and competencies in realistic career decision-making.

Test Content and Format: Three forms: Form A-2, Form B-1, and Form A-1. Form A-2: Designated as screening scale, contains 50 items, true/false response to statements, and scored by number of correct responses. Form B-1: Designated for counseling, contains 75 items, and includes 50 items from Form A-2. Form B-1 permits determination of five subscores. Form A-1: Consists of five subtests covering self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem-solving (competency). Each subtest contains 20 multiple-choice questions, four choices and "don't know."

Administration Time: Attitude (25-35) min., Competence (110-130) min.

Skills/Materials Required: 2 tests, manual, handbook, profile, administration.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile norms are available for the various scores of the inventory.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Based on responses from over 72,000 students broadly sampled throughout United States.

Reliability: Studies were completed on 2,000 students. One stability coefficient of .71 reported for large sample of 6th-12th graders over one-year interval. KR20 coefficients = .58-.90 with median .83

Validity: Limited validity information is reported. Intercorrelations of subtests range from .25-.73 with a mean of .54.

References:

Crites, J. O. (1973). Career maturity inventory. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Kelso, G. I. (1977). The relation of school grades to ages and stages in vocational development. Vocational Behavior, 10(3), 287-301.

Career Orientation Placement & Evaluation Survey (COPES)

Publisher:
EDITS
P.O. Box 7234
San Diego, CA 92107

Cost: $2.25

Date of Publication: 1978, 1986 latest copyright

Competencies Assessed: Personal values related to the type of work one chooses and the satisfaction derived from this occupation.

Population Characteristics: Grades 8 and up.

Recommended Uses: Career evaluation and guidance.

Test Content and Format: Multiple-item paper-pencil inventory measuring eight dimensions of personal values: investigative, practical, independent, leadership, orderliness, recognition, aesthetic, and social. Self-administered, suitable for group use.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, booklets, visuals, profiles.

Derived Scores/Information: Means based on the samples for grades 7-12 and the separate community college sample were not meaningfully different for interpretive purposes, and consequently, were combined to form a single norms sample. Means in percentiles.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms for the COPES based on a national sample of 6,253 intermediate and junior high school students in grades 7 through 12 and 700 community college students.

Reliability: Alpha reliability for internal consistency ranged from .67-.82. Intercorrelations based on high school sample--low magnitude, highest correlation = .47.

Validity: COPS and COPES work values with occupational interests = .47 accounts for 22% of variance. Thus the importance to the individual of doing work that is perceived intrinsically worthwhile is an indication of values. COPES with Gilford's Working for Thinking (r = .40), COPES with Allport-Vernon Theoretical (r = .33). Correlates with performance and vocational choice. Follow-up of preliminary sample of 237 of 268 were categorized as "hits."

References:

Knapp, R. (1967). Empirical Investigation of concurrent and observational validity of ipsative vs. a normative measure of six interpersonal values. Educational & Psychological Measures, 24, 65-73.

Knapp, R., & Knapp, L. (1978). Career orientation placement and evaluation survey, San Diego, CA: Edits Publishing Co.

Carrow Elicited Language Inventory (CELI)

Publisher: DLM Teaching Resources
P.O. Box 4000
One DLM Park
Allen, Texas 75002
(800) 527-4747

Cost: $53.00/set of testing materials including 25 scoring/analysis forms and 10 protocols; $4.50/25 tests; $4.50/25 protocols; cash orders, post paid; specimen set not available.

Date of Publication: 1974

Competencies Assessed: Grammar (articles, adjectives, nouns, noun plurals, pronouns, verbs, negatives, contractions, adverbs, prepositions, demonstratives, conjunctions), type (substitutions, omissions, additions, transportations, reversals), total.

Population Characteristics: Ages 3-7.11

Recommended Uses: To be used as a test of children's production use of selected aspects of language structure based on sentence imitation. Diagnoses expressive language delays and disorders. Used to obtain data on a child's grammatical structure. May not be useful for children with problems in the areas of severe misarticulations, severe jargon speech, and echolalia. Not appropriate for nonverbal subjects.

Test Content and Format: 18 scores, individual administration, no reading required by examinees. CELI is a set of 52 sentences which children are asked to imitate. The sentences vary in length from 2 to 10 words, and include a wide range of constructions. Scoring the imitations for number and types of errors (deviations from the model) can yield information about specific language/structures that a child has not yet fully acquired and, if desired, also a single numerical score. In addition, a more detailed but optional analysis of verb errors can be done on a separate verb protocol sheet. The child's responses are recorded and transcribed from the tape onto a scoring/analysis form, which provides a format for analyzing errors of substitution, addition, omission, transposition, and reversal.

Administration Time: 10-15 minutes for administration, 45 minutes for administration, transcription, and scoring.

Skills/Materials Required: Scoring/analysis form; manual; verb protocol sheet; training guide; training tape, 5 inch reel or cassette; audio-tape equipment necessary for administration.

Derived Scores/Information: Mean scores, percentile ranks, and standard scores are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: In 1973, CELI was administered to 475 white children between the ages of 3.0 to 7.11 years from standard English-speaking, middle SES backgrounds. All children were selected from day care centers and church schools in middle class neighborhoods of Houston, Texas.

Reliability: Reliability data include test-retest reliability, inter-examiner reliability in transcription of language responses from audio-tape, and inter-examiner reliability in scoring. To determine test-retest reliability, 25 children (5 each at the age levels of 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) were selected at random, tested, and retested after two weeks. The product-moment correlation coefficient obtained was .98. One indicator of inter-examiner reliability was obtained by correlating transcriptions and scoring by two examiners of 10 randomly selected tapes: the coefficient of correlation was .98. A second measure of inter-examiner reliability was obtained by administration, transcription, and scoring by 2 examiners and 20 children: the coefficient of correlation was .99. No further reliability data are available.

Validity: Three methods were used to determine validity: two of these involved concurrent validity and one involved congruent validity. Analyses of variance testing the age differences in total scores and in subscores were significant. The product-moment correlation coefficient between age and total error score was -0.62: it can be concluded that CELI has concurrent validity.

Also in the area of concurrent validity, CELI was used in a study to separate language-disordered children from children with normal language. She found that the CELI reflected a significant difference in total language score between the two groups (p .000). Significant differences (p .01) were also found between the groups in grammar subcategory scores of articles (p .001), adjectives (p .004), noun plurals (p .004), pronouns (p .000), verbs (p .000), negatives (p .01), prepositions (p .0025), and conjunctions (p .0047).

CELI and the Developmental Sentence Scoring (DSS) were compared in their ability to reflect the severity of language disorders in 20 children. A rank order correlation (rho) between the rank of the children by external clinical judgment and the CELI was 0.77 (p .01). The correlation between the CELI which uses error scores, and the DSS, an instrument which uses positive scores, was -0.79; the CELI, therefore, seems to have congruent validity.

Comments: A content-referenced test. Considered to be an extremely useful test for children from a standard English speaking community in testing productive language. However, the manual does not include discussion of problems encountered with children whose grammatical system may differ from the Standard English of the test sentences for reasons of social or ethnic dialect rather than individual immaturity or pathology of any kind. In addition, the exclusion in the test of more complex embedded or coordinated sentences, limits the test's usefulness with older or more advanced speakers.

References:

Carrow, E. (1974). A test using elicited imitations in assessing grammatical structure in children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 39(4), 437-444.

Cornelius, S. (1974). A comparison of the elicited language inventory with the developmental syntax scoring procedure in assessing language disorders in children. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

CHOICE

Publisher: Center of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services
Jull Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Cost: No Cost

Date of Publication: Unpublished/1978

Competencies Assessed: Client's personal interests, aspirations, preferences, and estimations of self-competencies.

Population Characteristics: Individuals with mild or moderate retardation

Recommended Uses: Self-direction regarding jobs and decisions about jobs.

Test Content and Format: Four parts to the inventory: Occupational Daydreams takes the form of a brief, highly structured interview of the client by the examiner, Activity Scale are activities organized and presented within the Holland categories and client is asked to mark a correct response, Job Scales requires client to respond to a series of real jobs organized and presented within the Holland categories, and Abilities Scale requires client to mark competencies.

Administration Time: Untimed

Skills/Materials Required: Color slides on an audioviewer, a simplified drawing of the slide in an answer book, examiner.

Derived Scores/Information: Scale scores

Norming/Standardization Practices: Sample was composed of persons in either rehabilitation facilities or vocational evaluation units in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

Reliability: Split-half reliabilities ranged from 0.67 to 0.82

Validity: Preliminary study of concurrent validity used Occupational Daydreams as a criterion. The resulting coefficient was 0.58.

References:

Beziat, C. (1978). CHOICE. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.: Center of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services.

Holland, J. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6, 35-45.

Choosing a Major at Penn State

Publisher: Division of Special Educ. and Communication Disorders
Disabilities at the University Level
Pennsylvania State University
State College, PA 16801

Cost: No information available.

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: Course requirements, test types, instructors ratings, assigned readings, class attendance, time management.

Population Characteristics: Postsecondary LD students; standard populations.

Recommended Uses: Assist students in identifying a manageable major area of interest - to assess selection of courses relative to requirements, attendance, time management, etc.

Test Content and Format: Course evaluation inventory, class attendance questionnaire, clinician's guide (intervention measures), time management questionnaire, clinician's guide to time management (intervention measures) - used in conjunction with Modern Language Aptitude Test.

Administration Time: Unknown.

Skills/Materials Required: Questionnaires.

Derived Scores/Information: No information given. Data analysis can be done by three instructional levels: developmental, average, advanced. 423 sample from English classes at the three levels. 14% - dev.; 78% - reg.; 8% - advanced.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Analysis of data from a sample of 423 students from several English classes resulted in the following classifications: developmental = 14%; regular = 78%; and advanced = 8%.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Clinical Evaluation of Language Functions-Diagnostic Battery (CELF)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, Texas 78204-0952

Cost: $19.95

Date of Publication: 1980 CELF-R 1987, September 1987

Competencies Assessed: Language processing and production abilities as well as receptive and expressive factors.

Population Characteristics: K-12

Recommended Uses: Identification and diagnosis.

Test Content and Format: A multiple item, verbal-visual test of phrase and sentence imitation, phrase completion, serial recall, antonyms, phonemic recall production, abstraction, and formulation of attributes. Version 6-12 has 52 items in a card game format. Examiner required and not suitable to group use.

Administration Time: 20 min. per-test - complete diagnostic battery takes 1-2 hours.

Skills/Materials Required: Audiotapes, picture manual, and score forms.

Derived Scores/Information: Criterion-referenced subtests. Means and standard deviations were reported. Scores by age for composite scores, percentile ranks by age for subtests and composite scores and age equivalents.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Representative sample of students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Reliability: Test-retest for each subtest fell between .56 and .98 with majority above .80 level. No standard errors of measurement.

Validity: Compared with Ill. Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA), Detroit, Wepman, Fisher-Logemann, Northwestern Syntax Screening, and Part V of the Token Test. Correlations positive and significant at .01 level. Range - .40-.94. Of 35 correlations reported, 29 were only at .40 and .50 levels. Intertest validity .02-.68.

References:

Semel, Eleanor, & Wiig, E. (1980). Clinical evaluation of language function. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Semel, Eleanor, & Wiig, E. (1987). Clinical evaluation of language fundamentals-revised. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Comprehensive Occupational Assessment and Training System (COATS)

Publisher: Prep, Inc.
1007 Whitehead Road Ext.
Trenton, NJ 08638

Cost: Price of components: (1) Job Matching $2,080; (2) Employability attitudes $1,285; (3) Living Skills $1,275. Work Samples average $897.

Date of Publication: 1975-81

Competencies Assessed: Vocational interests and aptitudes, work values, literacy skills and basic knowledge.

Population Characteristics: High school and adults in manpower and training programs. Youth oriented program content. The Living Skills component is also aimed at adult education.

Recommended Uses: Vocational exploration; vocational recommendations - individual jobs and clusters.

Test Content and Format: Employability attitudes, work samples, job matching, and living skills presented in an audiovisual format. Each component can be used independently.

Administration Time: Approximately 1 week

Skills/Materials Required: Training in use of instrument is part of purchase price. Projector, tapes, materials for work samples are part of the package. Consumables include test answer forms, instruction book, and exercises. The work samples use wood, wire, sheet metal, etc.

Derived Scores/Information: Computer-generated profiles. Time and quality scores are given for each work sample with the emphasis on quality. The work samples are scored by hand.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Adequate norming procedures used for all components except the work sample component. Time norms are available for only 11 of the 26 work samples.

Reliability: Manuals give reliability for all components. The reliability coefficients are adequate, but more detail on the procedures is necessary to judge the meaning of the results.

Validity: The manuals stress content validity for each of the components. Each component must be judged on its own merits.

Comments: This package focUses on the nonhandicapped, but may have potential usefulness with mildly mentally retarded. It is basically designed for client self-interpretation followed by activities to change behavior.

References:

Botterbush, K. F. (1980). A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Kapes, J. T., & Mastie, M. M. (Eds.). (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.). Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Forms U & V (CTBS)

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

Cost: $35-$46/35 booklets at 1 level
Scoring services and supplements are available

Date of Publication: 1981-1982

Competencies Assessed: Basic skills in reading, language, spelling, mathematics, reference skills, science, and social studies.

Population Characteristics: Grades K-12.

Recommended Uses: District-wide group achievement testing for placement, programming, and evaluation.

Test Content and Format: 10 levels; group administered using reusable test booklet and machine-scored answer sheet. Number and nature of subtests vary with each level.

Administration Time: 102-313 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test Booklet, Answer Sheet, Examiner's manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile, stanine, grade equivalent, normal curve equivalent and scale scores are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Fall and spring national norms on 250,000 students. No school or district norms are provided.

Reliability: Reliability data, when presented, appears adequate. Alternate form reliabilities and score stability information are not provided.

Validity: Validity data are presented, but they are scanty. Match with local curriculum is encouraged.

Reference:

Schell, L. M. (1984). Test review: Comprehensive test of basic skills (CTBS, Form U). Journal of Reading, 27, 586-589.

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

Publisher: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Ave., P.O. Box 60070
Palo Alto, CA 94306
415/857-1444

Cost: 25 School Form Test Booklets $5.00
25 Adult Form Test $3.00
Keys-Adult $1.00; School $1.75
Manual, No available price

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Measures attitudes toward the self in social, academic, and personal contexts.

Population Characteristics: Ages: School Form (8-15)
Adult Form (15-Adult)

Recommended Uses: Used for individual diagnosis, classroom screening, pre-post evaluations, and clinical and research studies.

Test Content and Format: 58 or 75 item paper-pencil test of self-attitudes in four areas: Social, self-peer, home-parents, school-academics, and general-self. Related to academic achievement and to personal satisfaction in school and adult life. Self-administered. Suitable for group use.

Administration Time: 15 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: 58 item school form, 26 item adult form, keys, manual, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Score derived by multiplying raw score by 2 on the School Form and by 4 on the Short Form and Adult Form. The basis for scoring is that a totally positive self-esteem score is 100 and a totally/negative one is 0.

Norming/Standardization Practices: N=86, grades 5 and 6, scores ranged from 40-100, X=82.3, S.D.=11.6, 1,748 public school children in Connecticut; female X=72.2, S.D.=12.8; Male X=70.1, S.D.=13.8.

Reliability: At all three levels, KR20 coefficients in excess of .80. Short Form reliabilities in low .70s.

Validity: Several studies support the validity of the instrument.

Comments: Observational rating scale should accompany the use of this instrument.

References:

Coopersmith, S. (1981). Self-esteem inventories. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gilberts, R. (1983). The evaluation of self-esteem. Family and Community Health, 6, 29-49.

Coping Mastery Scale

Publisher:
Dr. Leonard Pearlin
1350 7th Avenue
Center for Social and Behavioral Studies
University of California
San Francisco, CA 94143

Cost: No charge.

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: Measure of individual's sense of control over environmental forces

Population Characteristics: Adults, adolescents

Recommended Uses: Counseling

Test Content and Format: Questions/responses in a Likert scale format of strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Administration Time: 5 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Interviewer, form, pencil

Derived Scores/Information: Likert-scale scores are summed and used to examine patterns of response.

Reliability: No information found

Validity:

References:

Pearlin, L., & Lieberman, M. (1980). Everyday life experiences. Unpublished manuscript. Committee on Human Development. University of Chicago.

Pearlin, L., & Schuler, L. (1978). Structure of coping. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*.

Crawford Small Parts Dexterity Test

Publisher: The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Date of Publication: 1956

Competencies Assessed: Fine eye-hand coordination.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: Measure of fine hand coordination as part of a general assessment.

Test Content and Format: In Part I, the examinee uses tweezers to place pins in holes and then to put collars on the pins. In Part II, small screws are placed in threaded holes and screwed down with a screwdriver.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test apparatus, tweezers, screwdriver, stop-watch.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores can either be the amount of time necessary to complete the task or the number of assemblies completed in 3 or 5 minutes. Scores are converted to percentiles.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Normed on a wide variety of adults in different jobs as well as students in trade and technical schools or in academic settings.

Reliability: Split-half reliability coefficients between .80 and .95.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: The test has not been widely used with special populations. The relevance for placement and training appears limited.

Reference:

Crawford, J. E., & Crawford, D. M. (1956). Crawford small parts dexterity test. New York: The Psychological Association.

Daly-Miller Scale of Writing Apprehension

Publisher:
John A Daly
Department of Communication
Heavilon Hall
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Cost: Cost determined by Author

Date of Publication: Unpublished

Competencies Assessed: To assess writing apprehension and anxiety.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, Desensitization, Behavior Therapy

Test Content and Format: Sixty-three items composed with a Likert-type scale format and divided into categories dealing with writing anxiety in general, teacher evaluation of writing , peer evaluation of writing, and professional evaluations. Items pertaining to environments for writing are included. Likert scale requires responses of agreement: 1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Form, pencil

Derived Scores/Information: Scores range from 26 to 130. In standardization sample, mean score was 79.28 with S.D.18.86. High score represents high anxiety. Low scores represent low anxiety.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Instrument was completed by 164 undergraduate students enrolled in basic composition courses and interpersonal communications at West Virginia University in the spring of 1974. Students were from all of the colleges and schools at the University, represented several states, and came from a variety of social, economic, and family backgrounds.

Reliability: Split-half technique, top and bottom halves resulted in coefficient .940. Test-retest over a week was .923.

Validity: Correlation between in-class and out-of-class instruments resulted in a product moment correlation of .99 indicating measurement of same construct. Analysis of variance revealed individuals with high anxiety of writing perceived their occupations as having significantly less written communication than did those with low apprehension of writing. Low correlation between SAT-verbal and scores and writing apprehension scores suggesting aptitude tests may not measure predisposition to writing.

References:

Daly, J. & Miller, M. (1975 winter). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in teaching english. 9 (3), 242-249.

Rose, M. (1984). Writer's block: The Cognitive dimension, Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Defense Mechanism Inventory (DMI)

Publisher: David Inilevich and Dr. Goldine Gleser
University of Cincinnati Medical Ctr.
Department of Psychiatry
7110 College of Medicine
Cincinnati, Ohio 45267

Cost: $2.07 per 10 tests; $2 per 50 answer sheets; $2 per 50 profiles, $1.50 per specimen set; postage extra, scoring service, $.40 or less per test ($20 minimum)

Date of Publication: 1969

Competencies Assessed: Measures types of defense mechanisms (social skills)

Population Characteristics: Ages 16 and over

Recommended Uses: Research use only

Test Content and Format: A story is presented and is followed by a series of four questions about the story. Five statements are given as responses to each of the four questions. The examinee is asked to mark "+" to how he/she would react and "-" to how he/she would not react.

Skills/Materials Required: Male test, female test, answer sheet, male and female normed profiles, pencil, scoring key.

Derived Scores/Information: 5 scores: turning against object, projection, principalization, turning against self, abversal. Male and female norms based on percentile rank of five score categories:

	female	male
turning against	x=34.8, SD 8.1	x=39.4, SD 7.8
projection	x=36.9, SD 5.4	x=38.4, SD 6.7
principalization	x=47.3, SD 6.4	x=48.4, SD 6.8
turning against self	x=41.9, SD 4.9	x=34.4, SD 7.6
abversal	x=39.2, SD 6.8	x=39.6, SD 6.3

Norming/Standardization Practices: The standardization used small, atypically highly educated samples. Means and standard deviations were computed for males and females. College sophomores (N=406); Psychiatric outpatients (N=234); and a general adult" group (N=114) constituted the standardization sample.

Reliability: Stability coefficients ranged from .69-.93 with an average of .75.

Validity: Predictive validity and construct validity were not demonstrated

Comments: The instrument should not be used for routine clinical assessment, but it holds promise as a research instrument.

References:

Bogo, N., Winget, C., & Gleser, G. (1970). Ego defenses and perceptual styles. *Perception and Motor Skills*, *30*(2), 599-605.

Ihilevich, D., & Gleser, G. (1968). *Defense mechanism inventory*. University of Cincinnati Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry.

Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA-2)

Publisher: American Guidance Services
Publishers' Building
Circle Pines, MN 55014-1796

Cost: $86.50/complete kit
Software scoring system available

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: Measures general aptitude and specific abilities in 4 domains: linguistic, cognitive, attention, and motor.

Population Characteristics: Ages 6-17

Recommended Uses: To identify a student's global or specific aptitude strengths and weaknesses and for diagnosing learning disabilities and mental retardation.

Test Content and Format: 11 subtests; individually administered: word opposites; sentence imitation, oral directions, word sequences, story construction, design reproduction, object sequences, symbolic relationships, conceptual matching, word fragments, letter sequences.

Administration Time: 50-120 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Student response form, examiner record forms, summary and profile sheet, picture book, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores may be converted to standard scores and percentiles for the 4 domains as well as a General Intelligence Quotient. 9 composite scores are available: verbal aptitude; nonverbal aptitude; conceptual aptitude; structural aptitude, attention-enhanced aptitude, attention reduced aptitude, motor-enhanced aptitude, motor-reduced aptitude, overall' aptitude.

Comments: Information on norming, reliability, validity, and references had not arrived by the production deadline but will be included in a subsequent review.

Differential Aptitude Test (DAT)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost:
$20.50/25 tests
14.00/50 Digitek
13.50/50 IBM/NCS
$12.00/50 MRC
3.00/set IBM 00.5 scoring stencils
2.00/set of hand scoring stencils

3.00/set of IBM
4.25/specimen set

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: Verbal reasoning, numerical ability, abstract reasoning, clerical speed and accuracy, mechanical reasoning, spatial relations, spelling, language usage.

Population Characteristics: Grade 8-12 and young adults.

Recommended Uses: Career planning and counseling.

Test Content and Format: DAT is a battery of tests in two forms (S and T). Multiple-item paper pencil test of eight abilities including verbal reasoning, numerical ability, abstract reasoning, clerical speed and accuracy, mechanical reasoning, space relations, spelling, and language usage. A ninth score: summary verbal reasoning and numerical ability scores. Examiner required. Suitable for group-use.

Administration Time: 235 min. (30-Verbal, 30-Numerical, 25-Abstract, 6-Clerical, 30-Mechanical, 25-Space, 25-Language, 10-Spelling)

Skills/Materials Required: Test, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Eight scores are yielded for each test which are convertible to percentile ranks or stanines.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Vocational and Catholic school norms. H.S. sample is large and well-chosen - blacks overrepresented - sex bias in items. Not as effective with young adults due to low ceilings. Normed on 64,000 students in 76 schools in grades 1-12.

Reliability: Split-half reliability coefficients range from .86 to .93 -grades 9-12.

Validity: Lacks differential validity between tests, little evidence of factorial or convergent and discriminant validity.

References:

Bennett, G., Seashore, H., & Wesman, A. (1975). Differential aptitude test. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Menard, S., & Morse, B. J. (1984). A structuralist critique of the I.Q. delinquency hypothesis: Theory and evidence. American Journal of Sociology, 89, 1347-1378.

Elwyn Remedial Inventory One

Publisher: Elwyn Institutes
Elwyn, PA 19063

Cost: Information not available.

Date of Publication: 1971

Competencies Assessed: Basic life skills: Budgeting, Transportation, Banking, Saving, Shopping.

Population Characteristics: Originally adult, institutionalized population, but revised to meet needs of public school adolescents with learning disabilities, social deficits, and limited reading skills.

Recommended Uses: Diagnosis and instruction of basic skills essential to community living.

Test Content and Format: 9 part assessment including personal information, counting, alphabet, calendar skills, measurement (ruler), measurement (liquid and solid), time, monetary and social sight vocabulary. Student test booklet is highly visual requiring student to mark the correct picture. Personal information requires rote memory on the part of examiner. Questions are read aloud twice to the examinees by examiner. Intended for group use.

Administration Time: Approximately 30 minutes. The test is untimed.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, examiner's manual, pencil, score sheet.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores of correct responses for each category and total test. Each test is checked individually to identify deficit areas.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No norms or standards were given, although it would appear local norms could be developed based on any population.

Reliability: No information was given in the instructor's manual.

Validity: Items first based on the Gunzburg Social Assessment designed for a British population.

References:

DeWolf, L., Breese, M., & Piccari, P. (1971). Remedial inventory one. Elwyn, PA: Elwyn Institute.

English Language Skills Assessment in a Reading Context (ELSA)

Publisher: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
54 Warehouse Lane
Rowley, MA 01969

Cost: $8.95

Date of Publication: 1980

Competencies Assessed: Understanding of the meaning and grammatical correctness of English language statements.

Population Characteristics: Graded upper elementary - college.

Recommended Uses: Diagnosis and instruction

Test Content and Format: 25 item paper-pencil, multiple-choice test in five versions: beginning conversation, beginning narration, intermediate conversation, intermediate narration, and advanced narration. Student selects one of four words which best complete the sentence in the conversation or story. Self-administered and suitable for group use.

Administration Time: 30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Reusable tests, answer sheets, answer keys, manual

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted to percentiles. Scores place students at 1 of 8 levels of proficiency based on a master classification scheme (MCS) formula.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Adult immigrant students in open enrollment programs and students in the Intensive English Programs at the University of San Francisco and at San Francisco State University. Over 1,000 students were included in the testing from both groups.

Reliability: Kuder-Richardson formula 20 in .80's and low .90's.

Validity: There was a systematic increase at all levels and at all schools. Test correlations ranged from .58-.62.

References:

Ilyin, D., Doherty, C., Lee, L., & Levey, L. (1980). English language skills assessment in a reading context. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Oller, J. (1979). Language tests at school: A Brognatii approach. London: Longman.

Family Burden Questionnaire

Publisher: Dr. Agnes B. Hatfield
College of Education
University of Maryland, College Park

Cost: Determined by Author

Date of Publication: unpublished

Competencies Assessed: Burden to family and/or caretakers of chronically ill relatives, particularly related to stress and reaction to stress.

Population Characteristics: all ages.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, education, self-help.

Test Content and Format: Paper-pencil questionnaire to be filled out by a caretaker. Questionnaire consists of a series of behaviors stated in each of five subheadings. Subheadings are Effects on Family Life, Patient Symptoms, Intrusive and Disturbing Behaviors, Poor Task Functioning, and Emotional Burden.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Questionnaire, relative of patient

Derived Scores/Information: Scores reported in percentages representing the number of respondents who answered the questions. May be adapted to a Likert Scale, e.g., none = 0, some = 1, and a lot = 3. Items, subheadings, or total measures of central tendency could be used for guidance and counseling.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample consisted of members of Schizophrenic Association of Greater Washington (SAGW). The group was unrepresentative and consisted of suburban women of above-average education or income. Membership in SAGW indicated great concern for ill relative; 85% of participants were parents of schizophrenics and 15% were siblings, spouses, and other close relatives. Ill relatives were males between 20 and 30 years of age who were schizophrenic for a long time. Of the patients, 57% were living at home, 26% were in own home or group homes, and 17 % were hospitalized. Intended for local use.

Reliability: No technical data available.

Validity: No technical data available.

References:

Hatfield, A. (1978). Psychological costs of schizophrenia to the family. Social Work. 23 (5), 355-359.

Hatfield, A. (1977, April 15). Mental illness: Impact on the family. Paper presented at the 54th Annual Meeting of the Am. Orthopsychiatric Association. New York, NY.

Forer Vocational Survey

Publisher: Western Psychological Services
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Cost: $13.50/set 100 tests or answer blanks; $1.50/manual; $8.00/25 sets of both editions and manual

Date of Publication: 1957

Competencies Assessed: Attitudes, emotional and social patterns and psychological struggles may have a decisive bearing upon the individual's ability to work successfully.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults

Recommended Uses: Guidance counseling

Test Content and Format: This test is a projective method in the form of sentence completion. The present form is designed as a method for studying personality as it relates to vocational matters. Male and female form each contain 80 items. In these items the examinee is presented with specific situations and interpersonal relationships. These six situations, representative of significant work problems, are the following: authorities as persons, co-workers as persons, criticism, failure, taking orders, responsibility. Each category and items that relate to it reveal certain emotional strengths/weaknesses. Intended to show reactions, caUses for feelings/actions, and vocational goals.

Administration Time: 20-30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, M or F test, record form, administration

Derived Scores/Information: After reviewing the record form, it appeared there is no systematic way of scoring. Interpretation of open-ended responses is left largely to the examiner for catagorization. Forer's development and use of sentence completion evolved out of his clinical background in psychotherapy.

Norming/Standardization Practices: None

Reliability: No information found

Validity: No information found

Comments: Lack of attempts to study reliability and validity criticized by reviewers.

References:

Forer, B. R. (1957). Forer Vocational Survey. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Forer, B.R. (1953). Personality factors in occupational choice. Educational Psychological Measurement. 13, 361-366.

Functional Assessment Inventory (FAI)

Publisher: Dept. of Physical Medicine
and Rehabilitation
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Work characteristics.

Population Characteristics: Severely disabled adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: To describe a client's functional limitations and to describe how the consequences of most limitations are manifested.

Test Content and Format: 30 4-point behavior rating scales.

Administration Time: 60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Completed from review of records - client need not be present.

Derived Scores/Information: For each scale (item) the alternative responses range from no significant impairment in an area to mild moderate and severe levels of difficulty.

1. Vision (see Instruction)
    0. No significant impairment.
    1. Has difficulty handling work involving fine visual detail.
    2. Impairment sufficient to interfere with major activities such as driving or reading.
    3. Total or near total loss of vision (use cane for mobility out of doors).

Norming/Standardization Practices: Data have been collected on a large number of rehabilitation clients within various disabilities.

Reliability: Inter-rater reliability coefficients range from .74 to .80.

Validity: A series of studies conducted to assess the construct and concurrent validity were generally positive.

Comments: The Life Functioning Index (LFI) is designed to measure change in both vocational areas and in other areas of adjustment that are related to vocational success among clients.

Reference:

Crewe, N., & Athelstan, G. (1979). Functional assessment in vocational rehabilitation. International Journal of Rehabilitative Research, 2, 535-536.

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behavior (FIRO-B)

Publisher: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Cost: $3.25 per 25 tests; $.75 per set of keys; $1.00 per specimen (without manual); $3.00 per manual; postage extra

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: 6 scores of behavior toward others (social skills)

Population Characteristics: Grades 9-16 and adults

Recommended Uses: Measurement of interpersonal relations/needs

Test Content and Format: 27 items in a Likert scale formal covering areas of: Inclusion (expressed, wanted); control (expressed, wanted); affection (expressed, wanted) feelings which one directs toward others and which one desires others to direct toward him, e.g., I try to be with other people, with responses on scale of 1-6 (1=never, 6=usually).

Administration Time: 8-15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: A test, key

Derived Scores/Information: Three subscale scores can be combined into a composite score.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization was conducted with a variety of student and occupational groups.

Reliability: Test-retest correlation - over .70.

Validity: No information found.

References:

Schutz, W., & Wood, M. (1957). Fundamental interpersonal relations orientation-behavior. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Ryan, L.R. (1977). Clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test: Survey F

Publisher: Houghton Mifflin Co.
1 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02107

Cost: $6.24/35 tests, $1.50/specimen set of either edition, postage extra, separate answer sheet edition: answer sheets - $5.10/35 Digitek or IBM 1230, $2.70/35 IBM 805, $2.85/35 MRC, $10.00/100 NCS; hand scoring stencils - $2.00/set IBM 805, $1.00/set NCS; MRC scoring service - 35¢ and over/test; NCS scoring service - 20¢ and over/test; NCS materials and scoring service available from NCS Interpretive Scoring Systems

Date of Publication: 1969-72

Competencies Assessed: Measures reading achievement: speed and accuracy (number attempted, number correct), vocabulary, comprehension

Population Characteristics: Grades 10-12

Recommended Uses: Used to identify those students who would benefit from remedial or accelerated programs, to evaluate instructional programs, and to counsel students and report progress to parents.

Test Content and Format: 4 scores, 2 forms, 2 editions: consumable booklet edition and separate answer sheet edition. Multiple item paper-pencil test.

Administration Time: 50-60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Technical supplement, grade score norms, manual, separate answer sheets. There are two equivalent answer sheet forms: Forms 1 and 2 for hand scoring, and 1M and 2M for use with machine-scorable answer sheets.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores can be interpreted in the form of raw scores, percentile ranks, or standardized scores

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms were developed in 1969 by administering Survey F tests to a nationwide sample of more than 5,000 students in grades 9-12 in 35 communities. Students were also administered the Verbal section of the Large-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (1964 Multi-Level Edition).

Reliability: Alternate form reliabilities for Grade 10 were .90 for vocabulary, .91 for comprehension, .73 for speed (number attempted), and .78 for speed (number correct); for Grade 11 were .92, .88, .64, and .81 for the respective subtests above; and for Grade 12 were .88, .85, .78, and .80. Average split-half reliabilities were reported only for vocabulary and comprehension at each of the grade levels: for Grade 10 were .92 and .93; for Grade 11 were .95 and .94; and for Grade 12 were .93 and .93.

Validity: Validity not reported in test's technical supplement.

Comments: Interpretative comprehension abilities such as making inferences, separating fact and opinion, and determining the writer's fairness and objectivity are not assessed in this instrument. Manual and technical supplement are considered well done, with the later providing tables and explanations for further statistical interpretation.

The Geist Picture Interest Inventory

Publisher: Western Psychological Services
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Cost: $2.00/test; $6.50/record booklet - answer sheet (25); $8.50/set of keys; $6.50/set of cards; $3.00/manual; postpaid

Date of Publication: 1971

Competencies Assessed: Interest/motivation/vocational interests

Population Characteristics: Grades 8-16 and adults with reading disabilities

Recommended Uses: Counseling, career counseling, identifying employability; to determine occupations most preferred

Test Content and Format: 11/12 interest scores: persuasiveness, clerical, mechanical, musical, scientific, outdoor, literacy, computational, artistic, soc. service, traumatic, personal service; 7 motivational scores: family, prestige, financial, intrinsic, environmental, past experience. Identification of drawings which represent occupational interest.

Administration Time: 30-50 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Separate answer sheet, record booklet

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted into T scores assuming that the measured interests are normally distributed.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample included students in grades 9-12, two remedial groups, trade school sample, and university group.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability (6 mo.) fluctuates between .13-.94. M = .60's.

Validity: Content validity is questionable, concurrent validity not clearly demonstrated, construct validity assumed in comparison to Kuder, no predictive validity established in terms of environmental criteria.

Comments: May be useful with students who have expressive language difficulties.

General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)

Publisher: U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

Cost: No fee from State Employment Service; $2.10/Section I; $2.75/Section II; $3.95/Section II; $3.20/Section IV; $2.50/100 record blanks; $7.50/100 profile-record-cards

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Aptitudes measured include intelligence, verbal skills, numerical skills, spatial, form perception, clerical perception, motor coordination, finger dexterity, and manual dexterity.

Population Characteristics: Grades 9-12 and adults

Recommended Uses: Occupational counseling.

Test Content and Format: Test format includes subtests in the following: three-dimensional space, vocabulary, arithmetic reasoning, computation, tool matching, form matching, name comparison, making, assemble disassemble, place, and turn. Tests 9 and 10 requires the use of Uses Pegboard apparatus, tests 11 and 12 require the use of Uses Finger Dexterity Board apparatus, and all other tests are multiple choice. Forms A and B differ only in specific sampling of items in tests 1-7.

Administration Time: (1) screening device = 15-20 min.; (2) pretest orientation = 90 min.; (3) GAT-B = 150 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, handbook, tests, record blank, answer sheet; respondent, pegboard apparatus, finger dexterity board.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted to standard scores representing occupational aptitude patterns. Weighted raw scores are combined to form weighted composite scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Longitudinal study involving 36,000 high school students as of 1965. Large samples have been utilized. Norms are not separated for male and female.

Reliability: Coefficients of stability, i.e., test-retest coefficients for periods from a week to a year = .80-.90.

Validity: Longitudinal study determined validity as predictor of occupational success; 317 tetrachoric correlations = .24-.96 (med. = 65).

Comments: Practice affect occurs. Reliability and validity high enough to be useful in hands of employer and guidance counselor. Age factor shows up in most categories.

References:

General Aptitude Test Battery. (1958). United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Employment Security. Washington D.C..

Seitz, M.J. (1949). A follow-up study of the use of the General Aptitude Test Battery of the United States Employment Service in the Placement of High School Seniors. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Delaware.

General Clerical Test

(Formerly Psychological Corp. General Clerical Test)

Publisher: Psychological Corp.
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $8.75/25 tests
1.00/specimen
postage extra

Date of Publication: 1972

Competencies Assessed: Designed to measure aptitudes which are of importance in clerical work of all kinds.

Population Characteristics: Grades high school and up.

Recommended Uses: Instruction, counseling, training - but use of the test is probably as a predictor of grades in commercial or secretarial courses.

Test Content and Format: Nine parts are grouped to produce three subscores: Clerical (1-checking, 2-alphabetizing), Numerical (3-arithmetic computation, 4-error location, 5-arithmetic reasoning), Verbal (6-spelling, 7-reading comprehension, 8-vocabulary, 9-grammar). Total of 243 items.

Administration Time: 60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: 1 form, revised manual ('72).

Derived Scores/Information: Clerical subscore based on speed and accuracy in routine clerical tasks. Numerical subscore based on results from three kinds of numerical tasks that are generally met in clerical work. Verbal subscore is a measure of language skills. Scored by number of correct responses. Norms are provided for comparison with various clerical jobs. Raw scores can be converted to percentile by job type.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Quite extensive 1972 revision. More information on age and racial and ethnic background needed. Normed on males and females in 20 different clerical groups.

Reliability: Retest reliability data - coefficients .92, .88, .93, and .96.

Validity: Not clear whether it followed predictive or concurrent validity design. Coefficients for total, .40 and .77, subscore coefficients .40 to .50s. Low validity in industrial settings.

Comments: Compares favorably with other tests available in this area -- especially for prediction with academic groups.

References:

Blair, J. T. (1951). Factor analysis of clerical aptitude test. Journal of Applied Psychology, 35, 245-249.

Psychological Corporation (1972). General clerical test manual: 1972 revision. New York: Author.

Whechel, B. D. (1972). A "tested" procedure for improving clerical selection. Journal of College and University Personnel Association, 23(3), 68-73.

Global Assessment Scale (GAS)

Publisher: Biometrics Research/Research
Assessment and Training Unit
N.Y. State Psychiatric Institute
722 W. 168th St., Room 341
N.Y., N.Y. (212) 960-5534

Cost: $2.50

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: General level of psychopathology

Population Characteristics: Teen, adult

Recommended Uses: Diagnosis

Test Content and Format: Multiple item measure of overall individual functioning. Information from family, case records, and clinical workup are used to rate client's overall health or sickness on 100 point scale. Examiner required and not suitable for group use. Information can be elicited from direct interview, a reliable informant, or a case record.

Administration Time: After evaluation, 2 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Scale, case vignettes and keys

Derived Scores/Information: Scale values range from 1 (most unhealthy) to 100 (most healthy). Most outpatients will be rated 31-90; most inpatients will be rated 1-40. Ratings evolve from designated period and are not influenced by drug therapy or clinical therapy. Ratings are divided into 10-point intervals, e.g. 1-10, 11-20. Focuses on behavioral descriptions.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Five studies encompassing the range of populations to which measures of overall severity of illness are likely applied: 41 newly admitted psychiatric patients, case records of 120 psychiatric inpatients, 38 patients attending aftercare clinic, 18 high risk for schizophrenia subjects, and 34 brief case vignettes.

Reliability: Intra-class reliability coefficients for studies respectively: .76 with standard error 5.5; .69 with standard error 5.0; .91 with standard error 5.0; .61 with standard error 6.0 units; and .85 with standard error 8.0.

Validity: Concurrent validity - GAS intended to measure high scores so consequently has negative correlation to Mental Status Examination Record and Psychiatric Status Scale, e.g. GAS = .37; MSER = -.44 at admissions; 6 months, GAS = .67, MSER = -.62. GAS is good predictor of readmissions.

References:

Endicott, J., & Research Assessment Unit. (1976). Global assessment scale. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Endicott, J., Spitzer, R. L., et al. (1976). A procedure for measuring overall severity of psychiatric disturbance. Archives of General Psychiatry, 33, 766-771.

Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination (GFW)

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Building
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Cost: $23.00/kit of test materials and 50 response sheets; $3.50/50 response sheets; $1.75/manual; postage extra.

Date of Publication: 1970

Competencies Assessed: Speech-sound discrimination under 2 conditions: quiet and background noise.

Population Characteristics: Ages 4 and over.

Recommended Uses: To identify and assess the listener's ability to distinguish among speech sounds. Group pertaining with picture cards is recommended as a timesaving device when several young or retarded children are to be evaluated.

Test Content and Format: Individual administration; 3 parts including Quiet Subtest and Noise Subtest. Each of 60 test plates contains four line drawings representing four common monosyllabic words with different initial or final consonants, e.g., chair, fair, hair, pear.

Administration Time: 10-15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Examiners test kit; manual; record sheet; stimulus test words tape (7 1/2 ips, 5 inch reel or cassette); use of earphones recommended; set of 61 pretraining picture cards also available; high fidelity tape recorder and earphones necessary for administration.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Test was standardized on a general population sample numbering 745 and ranging from 3 to 84 years of age.

Reliability: Error analysis lacks satisfactory reliability. Test-retest reliabilities were .87 on the Quiet Subtest and .81 on the Noise Subtest with only 17 children used to determine these reliabilities, however, and they were preschool, speech-handicapped children in a clinical setting.

Validity: Validity of GFW was not established against any traditional word-pair discrimination test. Content, concurrent, and construct validity available. Content validity has not been clearly demonstrated.

Comments: Has been criticized for being a test of auditory closure rather than a test of auditory discrimination. Consideration of sex differences in auditory discrimination of boys and girls with learning disabilities has been ignored. Generally, reviewers have opposing opinions about whether the test discriminates well between normal subjects and learning disability children, disadvantaged children, mentally retarded children, and hard of hearing children with school learning problems, and children with speech and language problems.

References:

Bannatyne, A. (1975, March). Review of the Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 8(3), 130-132.

Swem, T. W. (1972). A comparative investigation of the auditory discrimination abilities of children in special education and regular education classrooms in the San Luis Valley of Colorado. Doctoral thesis, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque (DAI33: 3369B).

Gordon Occupational Checklist

Publisher: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
757 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Cost: $4.00/35 tests; .40/specimen set; postage extra

Date of Publication: 1967

Competencies Assessed: Occupational preference.

Population Characteristics: H.S. not planning to enter college.

Recommended Uses: Individual counseling, group guidance, surveys, and research.

Test Content and Format: 11 scores; business, outdoor, arts, technology, service; plus 6 optional response summarization scores; 240 statements of job activities found at the middle and lower levels of skills and responsibility. Student must underline all activities of interest, then return and circle number of ones which most interest, i.e.

1. sort and deliver mail, messages, and packages
2. do routine sorting, numbering, and stapling

.

.

.

.

.

8. determine best routes for delivery

Administration Time: 20-25 min.

Skills/Materials Required: test, answer booklet, pen/pencil

Derived Scores/Information: Summarization by underlined responses, underlined responses which are circled, and both totaled. Large box indicate diversity of interest. Counselors may use their own form of categorization to meet particular requirements.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Preliminary form administered to N=6,000 H.S. Sample. There are no norms from the primary data for purposes of interpretation. Gordon does not indicate where students were sampled.

Reliability: Test-retest=.81 (M.) and .82 (F.) for stability of numbers underlined. Test-retest reliability coefficients for item response within the same sample and between two different samples range from .83-.95. Response frequencies are stable over time and between samples. Test-retest completed within one-month interval.

Validity: Reviewers have commented that the test samples a fairly wide range of occupations, elicits responses to about one-third of the items and is considered worthwhile to those who take it. Relationships to other variables, e.g. intelligence, have not been studied.

References:

Cordon, L. V. (1963). *Gordon occupational check list*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Gordon, L. V. (1963). *Gordon occupational check list: manual*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Hall Occupational Orientation Inventory (HOOI)

Publisher: Scholastic Testing Service
480 Meyer Road
Bensenville, IL 60106

Cost:

$13.00/20 tests
5.00/20 handscored answer sheets
5.00/20 interpretive folders
1.50/career education reader
3.50/manual
(postage extra)
5.75 specimen set
(2.50 without manual)
scoring service/.80 per test with 35.00 min.

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Dynamic and interactive relationships among an individual's psychological needs, values, work satisfactions, work motivations, and occupational choice.

Population Characteristics: Grades 3-7, 8-16, and adults, low-literate adults.

Recommended Uses: Value to counselors and other educators concerned with facilitating aspects of career development on the part of students or clients. Age levels associated with three forms facilitate use in variety of settings with both children and adults.

Test Content and Format:

Young Adult Form: 270 Items pertaining to jobs/occupations.
Adult Basic Form: 100 Items pertaining to jobs/occupations (developed for reading - handicapped); oriented to world of work.
Intermediate Form: 100 Items with content that is school-focused, compliments career development programs.

All three designed to be self-administered, self-scored, and self-interpreted - responses on Likert-type scale from "most desirable" to "very undesirable."

Administration Time: 30-40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Counselor's manual, career education reader, scoring.

Derived Scores/Information: Scoring sheet contains 22 bands that represent the job and personality characteristics, each containing 5 groups of numbers. Raw score obtained by adding total number in each band. Idiographic item and scale interpretation (as opposed to normative or predictive) is an emphasis, normative stanines have been replaced by an absolute numbering system for idiographic profile interpretation.

Norming/standardization practices: N=425. Inventory is not normative; scale score derivation not described. There is no descriptive information on sample.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability = .83 for 23 scales over 3-week interval for 1400 subjects of various ages.

Validity: Face/content measured validity for items/scales. Intercorrelations between scales range from .79-.87. Scales are less independent than desirable. Predictive validity not reported.

Comments: Diversity of items on same scale; doubts about relationships to U.S.D.L. ratings; lack of specificity about standardization data presented; confusing conceptual stance regarding "matching" orientation. Designed for instruction, not measurement.

References:

Hall, L. G., & Tarrier, R. B. (1976). Hall occupational orientation inventory. Bensenville, IL: Scholastic Testing Service.

Pentecoste, J. C. (1975). Occupational levels and perceptions of the world of work in the inner city. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22(5), 437-439.

Small, J. A. M. (1975). Sex differences in personality characteristics of workers in selected occupations. Doctoral thesis, University of Houston, Texas.

Harrington O'Shea System for Career Decision Making

Publisher: American Guidance Service
Publishers' Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55435

Cost:

1 pkg = 25 survey booklets, 25 interpretive folders
1-4 pkgs each $29.00 - self-scored
5-19 pkgs each $26.50 - self-scored
20+ pkgs each $24.50 - self-scored

Profile Reports	Narrative Reports	Manual $6.75
1-4 pkgs each $59.50	1-9 reports each $8.00	Audiocassette $8.00
5-19 pkgs each $54.50	10-24 reports each $7.00	
20+ pkgs each $52.50	25-99 reports each $6.00	
	100+ reports each $5.00	

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Systematic approach to career decision making that integrates five major dimensions: abilities, job values, future plans, subject preferences, and interests.

Population Characteristics: Grades 7-12 and adults.

Recommended Uses: Guidance and career education counselors in junior and senior high and vocational-technical schools; colleges; and for adult job placements in social services, business, and industry.

Test Content and Format: Student/client completes survey booklet: stating occupational choices, school subject preferences, job values, abilities, plans for further education or training with "like" (2), "dislike" (1), or "I can't make up my mind" (1) responses. These 120 interest items contribute one of six interest scales: crafts, scientific, arts, social, business, and clerical. Summarized in Profile Report and Narrative Report.

Administration Time: 40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Survey booklet, manual, self-score device.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores on the highest two or three interest scales are used to identify three or four career clusters. Career clusters chart shows the typical jobs in each cluster, plus school subjects, job values, and abilities related to each cluster. Job listed key to Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Optional percentile rank norms available for grades 7-9, 10-12, and college freshmen.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The 1981 standardization took place using students in grades 7-12. School districts were randomly selected after stratifying all United States districts by enrollment and socioeconomic status. A college standardization was completed using colleges stratified by type and form of control.

Reliability: Correlations between student-calculated scores and author-calculated scores for six scales range from .96-.99, alpha coefficients for 6 scores = .84-.90. Test-retest over 30 days = .75-.94.

Validity: No predictive validity reported, Construct validity, Concurrent validity based on relationship to VPI (Vocational Preference Inventory).

References:

Harrington, T. F., & O'Shea, A. J. (1982). *The Harrington O'Shea career decision making system*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

O'Shea, A. J., & Harrington, T. F. (1980). The score reliability of self-scored interest inventories. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, *12*, 229-232.

Westbrook, B. W., Rogers, B., & Covington, J. E. (1980). Harrington/O'Shea system for career decision making. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, *13*, 185-188.

Holland Self-Directed Search

Publisher: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Career interests and aptitudes.

Population Characteristics: 15 years and up. For those whose need for vocational assistance is minimal.

Recommended Uses: Career counseling.

Test Content and Format: Self-administered, self-scored, and self-interpreted. Individual fills out the Self-Assessment Booklet, scores the responses, and calculates six summary scores corresponding to the themes of the Holland model (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social Enterprising, Conventional). The three highest summary scores are used to find a 3-letter code. This code is used to locate suitable occupations in the occupational classification booklet.

Administration Time: 40-50 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Assessment booklet and occupational classification booklet.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores are given on Holland's personality types and summed to give a profile.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Normed on high school and college students.

Reliability: Generally satisfactory for the summary scores.

Validity: Validity data are meager. There are controversies among psychometricians and counselors about the underlying theory, scoring, and interpretive procedures.

Comments: The instrument's brevity and do-it-yourself format make it appealing for use with persons needing minimum assistance or as an introductory activity in vocational counseling. These same characteristics limit its use with many persons with handicaps.

References:

Holland, J. L. (1979). The self-directed search: Professional manual, 1979 edition. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Home Activities Interview (HAI)

Publisher:
Deborah Moskowitz
Specialized Training Program
College of Education
Eugene, OR 97403-5215

Cost: Discretionary

Date of Publication: 1987

Competencies Assessed: General description of how the student performs outside of school.

Population Characteristics: High school students with moderate, severe, and profound handicaps

Recommended Uses: Module for describing process for IEP development and for involving teachers and parents in the process.

Tests Content and Format: Home Activities Interview is attended to be used in conjunction with the The Activities Catalog (Wilcox and Bellamy, 1987). HAI is a list of activities to describe whether activity was done in the past month, how often, where, with how much supervision, with whom, and whether it should be included as an IEP goal. Categories include exercise, games/crafts, etc. The Activities Catalog is used to determine what skills are needed. Categories align with domains of leisure, personal management, and work.

Administration Time: 5 minutes minimum but essentially untimed.

Skills/Materials Required: Form, summary form.

Derived Scores/Information: Activity summary includes total of different activities, frequency of activities, where the activities are done, and discrepancies with activities of others in household, HAI should be used to target activities to remedy imbalances, discrepancies or limitations in variety or frequency.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Community-referenced goals and objectives, originated as part of the Oregon High School Project (OHS) and enjoys collaboration with similar projects in Utah and Washington.

Reliability: Measured by consensual validation at staffing or IEP conference.

Validity: Construct will be identified in measured outcomes of IEP games and objectives.

References:

Ferguson, D., Flannery, K., Wilcox, B., Brawner-Jones, N., & Moskowhz, D. (1987), Module 2: Developing Activity-Based IEPs for High School Students with Severe Disabilities. Eugene, OR: College of Education, University of Oregon.

Wilcox, B., & Bellamy, T. (1987). The activities catalog. Eugene, OR: College of Education, University of Oregon.

Interest Determination, Exploration, and Assessment Systems (IDEAS)

Publisher: National Computer Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 1416
Minneapolis, MN 55440

Cost: Complimentary sample specimen set $4.75, postpaid; manual $2.50.

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Career preference.

Population Characteristics: Grades 6-12.

Recommended Uses: For young people as an introduction to careers and the world of work.

Test Content and Format: 14 Scales of Interest. 112 items in a five-choice response format: "Like very much - like somewhat - indifferent - dislike somewhat - dislike very much." Requires sixth grade reading level. Self scored. Group administered. Circle responses.

Administration Time: 30-40 min. (includes scoring).

Skills/Materials Required: Examinee, inventory booklet, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores can be converted to standard scores and can be plotted in graphic profile form. The average standard score is 50, and the standard deviation is 10. Most students score between 40-60. Highest scores point to areas of probable satisfaction.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Combined gender norms by age. Four normative populations: N = 306, females (6-8 grade); N = 292, males (6-8 grades); N = 1,681, females (9-12 grades); and N = 1,755, males (9-12 grades).

Reliability: Average test-retest reliabilities range in the high .80s and .90s.

Validity: Content validity and internal consistency in high .80s and .90s; construct validity in correlation to *Career Assessment Inventory* and *Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory* .91 and higher. Concurrent validity - relates meaningfully to occupational world.

Comments: IDEAS updated every two years in conjunction with new editions of the O.O.H. (*Occupational Outlook Handbook*).

Reference:

Johansson, C. B. (1983). *Interest determination exploration and assessment system*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems, Inc.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (1986) Edition

Publisher: Bureau of Educational Measurements
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801

Cost: $7.50 specimen set

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: General achievement levels

Population Characteristics: Grades 3-9

Recommended Uses: Concerned with fundamentals of elementary school instruction.

Test Content and Format: Five major areas: vocabulary, reading comprehension, language skills, word study skills, and mathematic skills. Group administration. Subtests are composed of a variety of item-response sets.

Administration Time: Each grade level 5 hours, 15 min. (4 sittings)

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, teacher's guide, counselor manual, answer sheet.

Derived Scores/Information: National percentile rank, raw score, and grade equivalent scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Original sample was random sample of 74,000 pupils in 213 schools and revised to be as close to true random sample as possible.

Reliability: Split-half reliability coefficients for total battery scores are .97 for grade 3 and .98 for all other grades. Subtest reliabilities generally in .80s.

Validity: Based on "all the commonly used principles" of validation of test content, curricular and statistical. Predictive validity not quoted but believed to be quite high.

References:

Anderson, V. (1961). A study of results when the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills are administered to selected low achievers in fifth and sixth grades. Master's thesis. Winona, MN: Winona State College.

Hieronymus, A. N., & Hoover, H. D. (1985). Iowa test of basic skills. Emporia, KS: Bureau of Educational Measurements.

Janis and Fields Feeling of Inadequacy Scale Revised Version
(Reformated for L.D. Students)

Publisher:
Lynda Price
L. D. Transition Project
General College
University of Minnesota
106 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Dr. S. E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Cost: Public Domain

Date of Publication: 1973

Competencies Assessed: Feelings of inadequacy/self-esteem.

Population Characteristics: High school students and adults.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, instruction, diagnosis.

Test Content and Format: Pencil-paper, 20 items with Likert Scale, 1 = very often; 5 = practically never. Questions relate to students' attitudes about themselves.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test manual, answer sheet.

Derived Scores/Information: Mean scores for individual items and overall test. Total score of 20 or less indicates low self-esteem. Higher than 40 indicates high self-esteem.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 185 high school juniors

Reliability: Split-half = .72 to .88

Validity: Internal consistency of first 8 items convergent .84 with Berger Scale. Convergent .67 CPI Esteem Scale .60 Self-Rating. Correlated significantly with test anxiety.

References:

Hovlin, C., & Jaris, I. eds. (1959) Personality and Persuasability New Haven, CT; Yale University Press.

Eagly, A. H. (1967) Involvement as a determinant in a response to favorable & unfavorable information. Journal of Personality: Social Psychology, Monogram 7 (3) (Whole Number 643) 1-15.

Berger, C. (1968). Sex differences related to self-esteem factor structure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 32, 442-446.

Jewish Employment Vocational Service Work Sample System (JEVS)

Publisher: Vocational Research Institute
Jewish Employment & Vocational Service
1700 Sansom Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Cost: Specimen set $7,975.00 - includes 28 work samples (hardware & consumables), training for one evaluator, and a two day consultation visit

Date of publication: 1973

Competencies assessed: Worker characteristics, functional abilities, time & quality scores, vocational training/placement recommendations

Population characteristics: Unemployed/underemployed, physically & mentally handicapped populations (higher functioning EMR and above)

Recommended uses: Gives descriptive evaluation and quantitative results for use in constructing vocational placement and training plans.

Test Content and Format: 28 work samples designed to assess vocational skills, work related behaviors, and interests

Administration time: 5-7 six-hour days

Skills/Materials required: 95% of all work sample materials are non-consumable "machines," tools, hardware. Consumables average $3.50 per evaluee. Administration should be standardized in an atmosphere resembling industry rather than a classroom.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores for production time and "product" errors. A ten-page narrative report is produced on each evaluee.

Norming/standardization practices: Normed on 1,200 educationally, economically disadvantaged, physically & mentally handicapped individuals served by vocational rehabilitation and Manpower installations

Reliability: No studies regarding reliability of JEVS are available. There is no evidence that the JEVS system is either better or poorer than most other work sample systems regarding reliability.

Validity: Results indirectly support the validity of the JEVS in that intelligence scores as measured by the Revised Beta are related to the work sample overall performance.

Comments: JEVS is tied into the 1965 D.O.T. and the 1979 Guide for Occupational Exploration. Because of this direct relationship, the system provides information regarding clients' strengths and weaknesses for work. Both experience and research have identified difficulties in using it with moderate and severely mentally retarded persons.

References:

Botterbusch, K.F. (1980). A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Kapes, J.T., & Mastie, M.M. (Eds.). (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

JEVS Work Sample Evaluation System. (1973). Philadelphia: Jewish Employment and Vocational Service.

Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (KABC)

Publisher: American Guidance Service
Publishers' Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55435

Cost: Complete kit: $143.00 (regular) and $178.00 (special)

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Assesses ability to solve problems using simultaneous and sequential mental processes; measures acquired knowledge.

Population Characteristics: Preschool/elementary (ages 2 1/2-12 1/2) - claims to be especially sensitive to diverse needs of minority and exceptional children.

Recommended Uses: Measure of general ability; evaluation of child's ability to apply mental processing skills to a variety of learning situations.

Test Content and Format: Multisubtest battery yielding scores in four global areas: sequential processing, simultaneous processing, mental processing composite (sequential plus simultaneous), and achievement. There are sixteen subtexts although a maximum of 13 are administered to any particular child. Subtests are as follows: hand movements, number recall, word order, magic window, face recognition, Gestalt closure, triangles, matrix analogies, spatial memory, photo series, expressive vocabulary, faces/places, arithmetic, riddles, reading/decoding, and reading/understanding. Individual administration.

Administration Time: Approx. 60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: 3 Easel kits, examiner test record, examinee.

Derived Scores/Information: Separate percentile rank norms, differentiated by ethnic groups and socioeconomic status. Mental processing subtests: scaled score X = 10, S.D. = 3 (national percentile rank, strengths/weaknesses, age-equivalent, local percentile rank); Simultaneous, Sequential, and Mental Processing Composite Scores X = 100, S.D. = 15 (national percentile rank, strengths/weaknesses, sociocultural percentile rank, band of error); Achievement subtests: standard score X = 100, S.D. = 15 with band of error at 68, 85, 90, 95 or 99% levels of confidence (national percentile rank, sociocultural percentile rank, strengths/weaknesses, age/grade equivalent, local percentile rank).

Norming/Standardization Practices: Stratified national norming sample (N=2100) - whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans. Exceptional children were systematically included in standardization sample in representative proportions. Sample based on 1980 census.

Reliability: Internal consistency coefficients range from .70 to .80 for subtests; Global score coefficients are in the high .80s and .90s. Reliabilities higher for achievement than mental processing. Test-retest reliability for subtests = .59-.98; clusters = .70s-.80s; global = .77-.97. New scaling procedure results in greater stability and articulation of the norms across the entire K-ABC age range.

Validity: Moderate to high correlations with other intelligence tests, but factor structure has been questioned.

Comments: Standardized with the Vineland, scoring clear, requires a qualified professional with sufficient background in psychology, neuropsychology, and cognitive psychology to administer.

References:

Herbert, W. (1982). Intelligence test: Signing up a newcomer. *Science News*.

Kaufman, A., & Kaufman, N. (1983). *Kaufman assessment battery for children (K-ABC)*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Nagweri, J. A., Kaufman, A. S., Kaufman, N. L., & Kamphaus, R. N. (1981). Cross validation of students' simultaneous and successive processes with novel tasks. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*.

Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (K-TEA)

Publisher: American Guidance Service Inc.
Publisher's Building
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Cost: K-TEA sampler: $3.50 postpaid (includes manual, five sample subtests, and descriptive information. $98.00/complete kit; $39.50/Brief Form Kit; $68.50/Comprehensive Form Kit; $9.50/25 Brief Form record booklets; $10.50/25 Comprehensive Form record booklets.

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: K-TEA Brief Form: mathematics, reading, spelling. K-TEA Comprehensive Form: mathematics, applications, reading, decoding, spelling, reading comprehensive mathematics computation.

Population Characteristics: Grades 1-12

Recommended Uses: As part of a comprehensive psychological or psychoeducational battery, for screening, program planning, research, placement, and personnel selection. In addition, K-TEA Comprehensive Form can be used for analyzing strengths and weaknesses and analyzing errors. The complete K-TEA package allows for pre- and post-testing. The K-TEA age-based norms can be used in learning disabilities assessments to meet the requirements of P.L. 94-142.

Test Content and Format: Individually administered; can be used for continuous assessment from grades 1-12; two forms provided: a Brief form for quick screening and a Comprehensive Form for in-depth assessment and detailed error analysis.

Administration Time: K-TEA Brief Form - 30 minutes. K-TEA Comprehensive Form - Grades 1-3: 30-60 minutes; Grades 4-12: 60-75 minutes.

Skills/Materials Required: Test plates in easel; Brief Form manual; Brief Form individual test records; Comprehensive Form manual; Comprehensive Form individual test records.

Derived Scores/Information: Derived scores for both forms, based on spring and fall data, include standard scores, percentile ranks, and stanines, by grade for grades 1-12 and by age for ages 6-18. Both grade- and age-based standard scores have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15, facilitating comparisons with test of mental ability which use the same metric, such as K-ABC and WISC-R.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The Comprehensive Form was normed with two separate standardization samples of school-aged children, tested in spring and fall of 1983. Spring sample included 1,409 students with approximately 100 students at each grade level from 1-12. Fall sample included 1.067 students, about 85 per grade. Of this fall sample, 589 students were included in the Brief Form equating study. Samples were selected to ensure adequate representation of population.

Reliability: Mean split-half reliability coefficients for the battery composites, by grade, were .93 for the Brief Form and .98 for the Comprehensive Form. The Comprehensive Form Reading and Mathematics composites were also found to be quite reliable with a range of .93 to .97 between grades 1 and 12. Reading Composite Mean was .96 and Mathematics Composite Mean was .94.

Validity: Validity is represented by content validity and internal and external analyses. External analyses were conducted with the standardization sample students who were all given the PPVT-R. About 60% of the students who were tested both on the Brief and Comprehensive Forms of the K-TEA were given one additional test battery: either the WRAT, PIAT, or K-ABC. In addition, recent group test scores for same students participating in the standardization were compared with K-TEA. Comprehensive Form results for the purpose of establishing K-TEA validity. Correlation with one group test, the Standard Achievement Test, are reported. Range of reading correlations between K-TEA and SAT were .50 to .80, for mathematics were .52 to .78, and composite score were .60 to .85.

KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publisher's Bldg.
Circle Pines, Minn. 55014

Cost: (1985) $51.00/kit, 25 diagnostic records, and manual; $8.75/25 diagnostic records for 1-4 pkgs, $7.95 for 5 or more pkgs; $6.00/manual; $7.50/metric supplement test and manual; $4.25/25 metric supplement response forms for 1-4 pkgs, $3.85 for 5 or more pkgs, postage extra

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Arithmetic skills: Content (numeration, fractions, geometry, and symbols); operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, mental computation, numerical reasoning); applications (word problems, missing elements, money, measurement, time); total; metric supplement (optional)

Population Characteristics: Preschool - grade 6 with no upper limit for remediation; originally developed for testing educable mentally retarded children (items require almost no reading or writing ability).

Recommended Uses: Considered to be diagnostically useful because deficit areas are delineated in considerable detail, enabling the teacher to write equally precise remedial prescriptions. diagnostic information provided includes total test performance; area performance in content, operations, and applications; subtest performance; and subtest item performance. Considered useful for evaluating and treating learning disability children. There is no upper limit for individual clinical and remedial use.

Test Content and Format: Total of 15 or 16 scores, individual administration, subtests, easel format. Scoring takes place during administration.

Administration Time: 30-40 min. (untimed)

Skills/Materials Required: Skills: items require almost no reading or writing ability: items are answered orally or by pointing, except for a few paper and pencil computation items. Only those items within a student's functional range are administered. Materials: test; optional metric supplement form; manual; metric supplement manual; diagnostic record; metric supplement response form; easel.

Derived Scores/Information: Grade equivalent norms available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Item Response Theory was used to calibrate and normalize test items. Grade equivalent norms are based upon a carefully selected national standardization sample. Supplementary grade percentile ranks and normal curve equivalents for grades 2-6 are available. Norming sample consisted of 1,222 subjects drawn from grades K-7 in 1971 and involved 42 schools in 21 school districts in 8 states. Schools used in the study were randomly selected from the district, and the subject population was formed by randomly selecting 6 pupils at each grade level. Each subject was administered a set of 5 items selected for measurement at that grade level at varying degrees of difficulty.

Reliability: No reliability data or norms available for metric supplement. Reliability coefficients for grades K-7 were obtained from a split-half analysis of the calibration population's performance on KeyMath. The performance of 934 individuals have been analyzed both by grade level and by subtest. Total measuers are consistently high across grade levels, ranging from .94 to .97.

Validity: Concurrent validity was obtained on some of the predecessors to KeyMath. Connolly (1968) reported a .59 correlation between the performance on a predecessor of KeyMath and the measured intelligence of 45 educable mentally retarded adolescents. He correlated the performance of 28 normal fifth graders on this same instrument with their performance on the arithmetic portion of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and obtained a .69 correlation with the reasoning measure and a .38 with the full-scale Iowa arithmetic score. These correlations were significant at the .05 level.

Comments: Considered a well-constructed test. Manual is considered excellent: provides clear instructions, background information, and behavioral objectives for each item.

Knowledge of World of Work Scale

Publisher: Reprints:
Dr. Andrew Kohen
James Madison Univ.
Harrisonburg, VA 22807

or

Reprint Series
College of Administrative
Science
Columbus, Ohio

Cost: Not established (Based on data from National Longitudinal Surveys, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Development and Training Act).

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: Assesses an individual's knowledge about the world of work which importantly affects several aspects of success in labor force.

Population Characteristics: Ages 14-Adult.

Recommended Uses: Vocational-educational counselor, social worker, employment agency, as well as researchers who are involved in the assessment of guidance of career choice.

Test Content and Format: Consists of three components. First component is multiple-choice format relating to duties of ten occupations, e.g., orderly, machinist, social worker. Second component involves identification of educational attainment, e.g., less than high school, diploma, some college, and college degree. Third component required judgment about annual earnings for eight occupation pairs, e.g., auto mechanic/electrician, medical doctor/lawyer, etc. = individual administration.

Administration Time: 45-60 Min.

Skills/Materials Required: Flash cards.

Derived Scores/Information: Potential and actual scores ranged from 0-56. White Males: X=35.3, M=35.4, S.D.=7.8; Black Males: X=26.9, M=26.3, S.D.=8.2

Norming/Standardization Practices: Based upon interviews in 1966 and 1968 with a representative national sample of about 5,000 young men between ages 14-24 and upon additional information collected in survey of high schools attended. Interview obtained occupational information, school survey revealed mental ability/school characteristics, e.g., vocational staff counseling. Follow-up in 1968 revealed earnings and occupational assignments at the time.

Reliability: Reliability using total sample of respondents is .7 by Kuder-Richardson formula and by the Spearman-Brown inter-item correlation measure. Value of Spearman rank correlation coefficient, based on proportion of each group answering each item correctly, is +.91.

Validity: Explanatory variables account for 19% of variance in white male scores and 31% among black males. Support hypothesis that a youth's knowledge about world of work has an independent effect upon earnings and occupational assignment. Economically, a five-point gain in test score (1968) would yield a gain in annual income of $140 for a steadily employed white, $290 for a black.

Comments: No females were included in sample. Youth in urban areas score higher than rural peers. Vocational counseling had little impact on test scores.

References:

Breinich, S., & Kohen, A. (1975). Knowledge of the world of work: A test of occupational information for young men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *6*, 133-144.

Parnes, H., & Kohen, A. (1975). *Occupational information and labor market status. The case of young men*. Columbus: Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University.

Kolb Learning Styles Inventory (LSI)

Publisher: McBer and Company
137 Newbury St.
Boston, MA 02116

Cost: $55.00

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: To help individuals assess their ability to learn from experience. The experiential model represents a circular process based on concrete experiences/observations/reflections/formation of abstract concepts/generalizations, testing implications of concepts is now situations, and new concrete experiences.

Population Characteristics: High school/college/adults.

Recommended Uses: Diagnosis, instruction.

Test Content and Format: The test is a 12-item questionnaire in which respondents attempt to describe their learning style. Each item asks respondents to rank-order four sentence endings that correspond to the four learning modes. -- Concrete experience (feeling), abstract conceptualization (thinking), reflective observation (watching), and active experimentation (doing). Two combinations indicate the extent to which an individual emphasizes abstractness/concreteness and action/reflection.

Administration Time: 10 min. (can be self-administered)

Skills/Materials Required: Test form, pencil, actual dialogue between examiner and examinee.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores will range from -36 to +36. Raw scores converted to standardized percentile scores, or "target" and "grid" normative profiles.

Norming/Standardization Practices: A sample of 638 men and 801 women who were ethnically diverse and representative of wide range of careers. Average education of the sample is 2 years at college.

Reliability: Four basic scales and two combination scores .73-.88 (Cronbach's Alpha) and Tukey's Additivity Power .91-1.09. Correlations between original and new form: split-half Spearman-Brown .71-.85 for items and .87-.93 for total N = 268. Intercorrelations among raw scores follow predictions of experiential learning theory. Strongest negative relationships between AC and CE (-.85) and AE and RO (-.80). No relation (statistical independence) between AC-CE and AE-RO. (N = 1,446)

Validity: Studies indicate a relationship between styles and career field of study: Accommodator, divergent, convergent, assimilator.

References:

Kolb, D. (1985). Learning Style Inventory. Boston, MA: McBer and Company.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuder Preference Record-Vocational (Kuder-C) (Kuder-E)

Publisher: Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 N. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Cost: $15.75/25 tests — Postage extra
5.50/25 pins, 25 backboards — Manual free on request
2.80 specimen set

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Reveals occupational interests, perceived skills, as well as disinterests.

Population Characteristics: Grades 9-16 and adults.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, career decisions.

Test Content and Format: The record is self-administered and the examinee makes one 1st choice and one last choice for each triad of activities relevant to ten broad areas. KPR requires a 9th grade reading level to complete. It is a paper-pencil test.

Administration Time: 30-40 min. (adults); high school students may take longer - no time limits.

Skills/Materials Required: Tests, administration, answer pads.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores obtained for each occupational area and converted to stanines. Charts provided to show examinee's comparison with working adults in 41 occupational families. Occupational areas include: outdoor, mechanical, computational, scientific, persuasive, artistic, literary, musical, social service, and clerical.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 3,418 boys and 4,466 girls in 9-12 grades and 1,000 men and 1,529 women participated in the standardization. Sample was stratified on SES, region of country and sex.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability coefficients are generally around .70.

Validity: Validity was said to be found in old Forms A and B. Manual of Form B suggested validity in .30s and .40s with the Kuder compared to Iowa H.S. Content, Iowa English Training, and Iowa Silent Reading Tests. Kuder compared with general and special abilities tests is about .40 correlation with grades not reported. Names assigned to scores are generally appropriate. An extensive set of references provides evidence of predictive validity.

References:

Kuder, F. (1976). *Kuder preference record-vocational*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Pierce, S. W. (1976). *An interbattery factor analysis of the domains of personality and interest as assessed by the GZTS and the KPR-V*. Doctoral thesis. University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Leisure Interest Survey

Publisher: Richard Zachmeyer
Kentucky Coalition for Career & Leisure Dev.
366 Waller Avenue, Suite 119
Lexington, KY 40504

Cost: Free

Date of Publication: unpublished

Competencies Assessed: To assess interest in spare time activities, background of experiences, and frequency of activities.

Population Characteristics: All populations, but some populations may require assistance from another adult.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, Assessment.

Test Content and Format: Survey consists of areas of interest, e.g. Arts and Crafts and areas consist of variety of activities. The examinee is asked whether the activity has been tried, how many times, and the degrees of interest in the activities. Degree of interest is measured by "strong," moderate," or "none."

Administration Time: 15-20 minutes (longer contingent on population).

Skills/Materials Required: Examinee, examiner, form

Derived Scores/Information: Surveys are interpreted on an individual basis.

Norming/Standardization Practices: There has been no norming or standardization. The state of Kentucky may use the instrument statewide, however, which could be basis for norms and standards (personal communication, April 23, 1987).

Reliability: No reliability studies have been done at this time.

Validity: No validity studies have been done at this time.

Reference:

Zachmeyer, R., Barnett, J., Nance, J., West, L., Benton, D., & Fortney, B. (1983). Leisure Interest Survey.

Leisure Time Activities Scale

Publisher: Unpublished
University of Chicago
Committee on Human Development

Cost: None

Date of Publication: 1963

Competencies Assessed: Leisure time activities.

Population Characteristics: Elementary/secondary students/handicapped with assistance/ adults

Recommended Uses: Facilitating access to meaningful leisure activities.

Test Content and Format: 36 item fill-in-blanks with numbers relating with whom activity is done and how frequently within a month the activity is done. Responses are in Likert form, e.g., 1 = "Haven't done it in the last 3-4 weeks" or 6 = "Alone." Test is orally administered to respondent or relative of respondent.

Administration Time: 20-30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Checklist, examiner, examinee

Derived Scores/Information: Scores are based on the sum of frequency summed with number representing companion or lack thereof. Example: A score of four indicates that the respondent has done an activity several times a week for the past 3-4 weeks. A score of 10 indicates the activity was done with a professional. Therefore, this respondent is socially active but dependent on professional assistance.

Norming/Standardization Practices: This assessment was described as one of a set of instruments developed through a grant sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health. This form was not specifically described in this study.

Reliability: No reliability data reported. Authors claim that reliability of complex, inferential clinical ratings of social, personal, and clinical adjustment in any living situation is influenced by the level of expertise of rater. Expertness of clinical raters varies.

Validity: An attempt was made to separate the actual behavior of patient from attitudes expressed by patient and other informants, but little actual data have been reported.

Comments: Used widely in many mental health settings.

References:

Cauan, R.S., Burgess, E.W., Havinghurst, R.J., & Goldhamer, H. (1949) Personal adjustment in old age. Chicago: Science Research Association.

Katz, M., & Lyerly, S. (1963). Measurement of adjustment and social behavior: Rationale, description, discrimination, validity, and scale dev. Psychological Reports. 13, 503-535.

Leiter Intelligence Scale (LIS)

Publisher: Stoelting Co.
1350 S. Kostner Ave.
Chicago, IL 60623

Cost: Test kit (all test materials, manual and 100 record blanks) $132.00

Date of Publication: 1972

Competencies Assessed: Measures intelligence by means of nonverbal items.

Population Characteristics: 2 years-Adults

Recommended Uses: Assessment, programming, placement, instruction.

Test Content and Format: Six oral response and task performance tests assessing verbal and nonverbal intelligence. Verbal test includes: similarities-differences, digits forward and backward, and free recall-controlled recall. Nonverbal tests include: pathways (following a prescribed sequence), stencil designs (reproduction of designs), and painted cube test (duplication of designs). Test results identify deficits in cognitive, psycho-physical or social areas and provide a measure of functional efficiency for psychologically disabled and superior individuals. Examiner required. Not for group use.

Administration Time: 30-45 min.

Skills/Materials Required: 1 form, manual, revised record booklet.

Derived Scores/Information: Age-scale format. Ratio method used to compute IQ's.

Reliability: Conducted with a sample of 256. Reliability generally in .80s with N=256, Digits (.65) and Stencil Design (.67) having lowest coefficients.

Validity: Concurrent validity study correlated LIS with Stanford Binet. Subtest correlations ranged from .57-.88; .88 total scale.

Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale

Publisher: Unpublished - Available from author upon request

Laird Heal
Dept. of Special Education
University of Illinois
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Mentally retarded persons' satisfaction with their residence, friends, community, and opportunities.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded adults.

Recommended Uses: Program evaluation.

Test Content and Format: 29-item interview which is read to the subject, e.g., "Are you happy with what you do in your free time?" Open-ended or yes/no responses.

Administration Time: 20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Interview form.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores raange from -30 to +20 on 4 Subscales: Community Satisfaction, Friends and Free-time Satisfaction, Satisfaction with Services, General Satisfaction. General Satisfaction scores ranges from -80 to +80.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Original standardization conducted with 38 subjects. Mean scores are available for this group.

Reliability: Test-retest range from .44 to .95. Inter-rater reliabilities range from .60 to .99. Internal consistency ranges from .56 to .85.

Validity: Intercorrelations among subscales and discriminative validity studies give evidence of construct validity.

Reference:

Heal, L. W., & Chadsey-Rusch, J. (1985). The lifestyle satisfaction scale (LSS): Assessing individuals' satisfaction with residence, community setting, and associated services. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 6, 475-490.

McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System

Publisher: McCarron-Dial Systems
P.O. Box 45628
Dallas, TX

Cost: $323.75 for entire system except WAIS and Stanford Binet. $140.00 for 100 copies of all forms.

Date of Publication: 1978-81

Competencies Assessed: Ability to function in variety of work settings: work potential, vocational competency, and independent living capacity.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded, mentally ill, learning disabled.

Recommended Uses: Results can assist in developing vocational objectives in IEP's, provides predictive information about vocational competency and productivity , wage-earning power, probability of competitive employment, and independent living capacity.

Test Content and Format: Uses psychological test, behavior rating scales, manual dexterity tests to measure verbal-cognition, sensory, motor, emotional ability, and integrating-coping skills.

Administration Time: Emotional stability and integrating-coping skills measurement requires 2 weeks of observation in a work setting. Other components can be completed in one day.

Skills/Materials Required: Requires training to administer. Materials are part of the system. Formal testing setting used for three of the components; the other two require a period of placement in a work setting.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores for each task area converted to percentile and plotted on a profile sheet.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Manual and research Publications contain empirical and statistical Characteristics of various norm groups.

Reliability: Most data used test-retest methods and reported correlations in the high .80s and low .90s.

Validity: Studies demonstrated predictive validity of the system to functional living levels and vocational competency. Investigators have reported substantial correlations between the various subscales and successful job performance as measured by the San Francisco Competency Scale.

Comments: Provides comprehensive neurobehavioral approach to vocational assessment for developmentally disabled youth and adult populations. Use of the system during the high school years through transition and into adulthood is currently being demonstrated in a federally funded transition project. The system does not address supported employment options in its definitions of vocational programming levels.

References:

Botterbush, K. F. (1985). Norms, reliability and validity in commercial vocational evaluation systems: A critical review. In C. Smith & R. Fry (Eds.), National forum on issues in vocational assessment: The issue papers (pp. 24-32). Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute.

Kapes, J. T., & Mastie, M. M. (Eds.) (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.), Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Patton, P. L., & Marinoble, R. (1986). Predicting vocational programming levels for handicapped students using the McCarron-Dial System: Implications for the supported employment model. Unpublished manuscript.

Pruitt, W. A. (1977). Vocational (work) evaluation. Menomonie, WI: Walt Pruitt Associates.

McCarron Prevocational Assessment

Note: Although in use by some projects, this instrument is not available for publication and dissemination at this time.

Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment (MESA)

Publisher: VALPAR International
3801 E. 34th St.
Tucson, AZ 85713

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Physical capabilities, mobility, vocational interests and awareness.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: Screening for vocational interests and skills.

Test Content and Format: Microcomputer and work sample approach are combined in this individually administered battery.

Administration Time: 3 1/2 hours

Skills/Materials Required: Microcomputer, printer, MESA system.

Derived Scores/Information: Computer generated scoring and report writing.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Reference:

Field, T. F., & Orgar, W. (1983). *Measuring worker traits*. Athens, GA: VDARE Service Bureau.

Micro-TOWER

Publisher: ICD Rehabilitation and Research Center
340 E. 24th St.
New York, NY 10010

Cost: $7,943.00

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: General aptitude plus verbal comprehension, manual dexterity, finger dexterity, clerical perception, numerical reasoning, motor coordination, spatial reasoning.

Population Characteristics: All intelligence levels, physically disabled, hearing impaired. Third grade reading level is required for verbal tasks.

Recommended Uses: Brief assessment of job related aptitudes; may be used as a preliminary to the more time-consuming TOWER system.

Test Content and Format: Group administered aptitude test which utilizes work sample approach (13 specific work samples). Instructions are administered through photographs and cassettes. Training on each task is given prior to the examination period.

Administration Time: 15 hours (3-5 days)

Skills/Materials Required: Work sample system, audiocassettes and tape player, scoring forms, several manuals.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores for each work sample are compared to the desired norm group. A scale is used to convert the scores into one of 5 possible ratings based on percentile norms.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms available on 19 groups ranging in size from 40 to 1300. Sample characteristics are adequately described. Groups include: physically disabled, psychiatrically disturbed, cerebral palsied, special education students. Publisher will assist in local norm development. No employed worker norms or industrial standards are used.

Reliability: Test-retest, alternate forms, and internal consistency coefficients range from .74 to .97.

Validity: Factor analysis revealed a large general factor and evidence of the separate aptitude areas. Construct validity is supported by intercorrelations among work samples and correlations with the GATB. All data are reported in the technical manual.

Comments: This instrument is to be commended for the attention paid to standardization and for the amount of technical data presented. The manuals are clear and well written. Training is included in the administration sequence, giving the examiner an opportunity to evaluate the examinee's response to training. The work samples themselves bear a limited resemblance to actual work and opportunity for observation in an actual job setting is not possible.

Reference:

Backman, M. E. (1975). Micro-TOWER: A new concept in work evaluation. In S. D. Michael (Chair), New developments in work evaluation. Presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, New York City.

Minnesota Clerical Test

Publisher: Psychological Corp.
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 72204-0952

Cost: $2.15/25 tests; $.50/specimen set; postpaid

Date of Publication: 1959

Competencies Assessed: Test of speed and accuracy in performing tasks related to clerical work.

Population Characteristics: Grades 8-12 and adults

Recommended Uses: Selecting clerical employees and advising persons who wish to seek training in the clerical field.

Test Content and Format: Two parts: Number checking and name checking. Each part contains 200 items consisting of 100 identical pairs and 100 dissimiliar pairs. Examinee is asked to check identical pairs. "Numbers" range from three through 12 digits; "names" contain 7 through 17 letters. Clear instructions are given.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, 2 test booklets, self-scoring key

Derived Scores/Information: Score for each part is items correct minus number wrong up to line drawn by examiner. Items beyond line are not scored. Maximum score on each test is 200. Percentile rank by age and grade equivalents are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 25 industrial groups. Norms are given by sex. Applicants and employees have also been separated. St. Paul public school pupils, grades 8 through 12. Grade norms should be used in junior/senior high schools and commercial business courses for guidance. Norms for adults employed for selection. Norms for 11th and 12th grade students - cross-section sampling of 6,262 pupils from 76 representative New England high schools.

Reliability: Reliability coefficients for bank groups estimated by formula .74 (numbers), .82 (names) for experienced machine operators, .78 (numbers) and .83 (names). These studies may be considered under estimates due long interval between test-retest.

Validity: Correlations between test scores and personal history .65; unemployed clerical workers found to score significantly lower than employed clerical workers. Two parts of MCT correlate .70 - sufficiently low to consider individually. Correlations between MCT and three other clerical tests ranged from .55-.71.

Comments: Test is old and holds little relevance to current skill requirements.

References:

Andrew, D., & Paterson, D. (1937). Analysis of the Minnesota vocational test for clerical workers, I and II. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *21*, 18-47, 139-172.

Andrew, D., & Paterson, D. (1959). *Minnesota clerical test 1959 revision*. New York: The Psychological Corporation

Minnesota Occupational Importance Questionnaire

Publisher: Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota
N620 Elliott Hall
75 E. River Rd.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Cost: Specimen set: free.

Date of Publication: 1975 edition; 1981 User's Manual; Machine score: 1.30.

Competencies Assessed: Measure vocational needs, preferences for various reinforcers available in the work environment.

Population Characteristics: Adults and high school students, ages 16 and above, both sexes.

Recommended Uses: Career counseling, employment counseling, training.

Test Content and Format: Paired-comparison: 190 paired items and examinee is asked to select one. Ranked form: examinee asked to rank each of five statements in 105 required responses. 20 scales of needs include security, social status, compensation, achievement, recognition, etc. A section asks each examinee to check which items are important at all. The absolute judgments allow a zero point. All items and scales based on six values: achievement, altruism, autonomy, comfort safety, status, group use.

Administration Time: Paired form: 30-40 min./Ranked form: 15-25 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Reusable test booklet, answer sheet, machine scoring, pencil, examiner.

Derived Scores/Information: Computer scoring available at University of Minnesota; hand scoring too laborious . New MIQ profile is in preparation with recent structural and cluster analysis, intra-individual adjusted Z-scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Occupational correspondence scores based on occupational reinforcer ratings from employees and supervisors in 185 occupations.

Reliability: Test-rest reliability coefficients (9-month interval) between .19 and .93 (for an immediate retest), between .48 and .89. Median coefficients of profiles are higher than scale scores ranging from .70 (4 month) and .95 (immediate).

Validity: Scale intercorrelations range from .05 to .77, median = .33. Validity data are limited.

Reference:

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1975). Minnesota importance questionnaire. Minneapolis: Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota.

Minnesota Paper Form Board Test - Revised

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Date of Publication: 1970

Competencies Assessed: Mechanical ability requiring the capacity to visualize and manipulate objective space.

Population Characteristics: Grades 9-12 and adults.

Recommended Uses: As an indicator of ability to perform highly technical, abstract visual tasks.

Test Content and Format: Speed test consisting of 64 two-dimensional diagrams cut into separate parts. For each diagram, there are five figures with lines indicating the different shapes out of which they are made. From these, the subject chooses the one figure that is composed of the exact parts that are shown in the original diagram.

Administration Time: 20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test form, pencil, scoring key.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile norms are available for a variety of educational and industrial groups.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Normed on a wide variety of educational and occupational groups since 1948.

Reliability: Alternate form reliability coefficients in .80s.

Validity: The test has a long history of effective prediction in many academic and industrial fields, particularly those with a mechanical orientation. Moderate to high correlations with performance in shop courses, grades in engineering and other technical fields, supervisor's ratings, and production records.

Comments: Although the test has been widely used and researched, its utility for transition seems limited to highly technical, engineering fields.

Reference:

Likert, R., & Quasha, W. (1970). Revised Minnesota paper form board. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Minnesota Rate of Manipulation - Revised

Publisher: American Guidance Service
Publishers Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Date of Publication: 1969

Competencies Assessed: Manual dexterity.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: Screening an individuals ability in finger-hand-arm dexterity tasks.

Test Content and Format: 5 subtests in which blocks are turned, moved, and placed in prescribed ways that require finger movements and hand-arm movements.

Administration Time: 50-60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: 2 test boards, blocks, record form, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores can be converted to percentile ranks, stanines, and standard scores. "Critical scores" can be established by the examiner to provide information for judging performance.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms are presented for two groups: unemployed older adults (1946 norms) and employed and unemployed young adults (1957 norms).

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: Norms are outdated and not related to current production standards.

Reference:

Field, T. F., & Orgar, W. (1983). Measuring worker traits. Athens, GA: VDARE Service Bureau.

Minnesota Spatial Relations Test

Publisher: American Guidance Service Inc.
Publisher's Bldg.
Circle Pines, Minn. 55014

Cost: $48.00/testing outfit; record form - 50 @ 3.50

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Spatial visualization ability based on performance - accuracy and speed in the discrimination of three dimensional geometric shapes.

Population Characteristics: Ages 11 and over

Recommended Uses: Evaluation of student or employee performance in courses or jobs that require accurate perception of spatial relations, e.g., employee selection, rehabilitation and training, aptitude assessment, occupational guidance/counseling.

Test Content and Format: 2 scores: content and time - four boards - block designs, 58 blocks - small, medium, large. The boards (A,B,C, and D) require the examinee to take blocks out of "B" and place in empty "A" and vice versa. The same process is done with "C" and "D"

Administration Time: 10-20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, 4 boards, record form, examiner, stop watch, square table, a chair.

Derived Scores/Information: Time scores converted to standard scores, then to percentile ranks. Error scores convert directly to percentile.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Percentile norms available on large group of people between the ages of 16 and 24.

Reliability: Split-half test reliability was in .80s and .90s for time, high .80s for error. Item pairs on sample groups was low .90s for time, .67-.84 for errors.

Validity: Time and error scores correlated with important criteria such as performance on the job or in preparatory courses of study. Analyses of data for some groups tested in norming program showed MSRT to be especially effective in the prediction of significant job performance criteria for the group of industrial workers and in the prediction of instructor ratings of mechanical ability for drafting/design students. Studies narrow in scope, suggest users of MSRT do more local studies.

References:

Paterson, D.G., Elliott, R.M., Anderson, L.D., Toops, H.A., & Heidbreder, E. (1930). Minnesota mechanical ability tests. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tyler, L.E. (1965). Psychology of human differences, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT)

Publisher: Psychological Corp.
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $3.50/25 tests; $3.60/50 IBM answer sheets/50 practice sheets; $.60/set of stencils and manual; $.75/specimen set; $7.50/tape

Date of Publication: 1967

Competencies Assessed: Aptitude for learning any foreign language and success in learning to read, write, and translate a foreign language.

Population Characteristics: Grades 9 and over.

Recommended Uses: Counseling for foreign language courses.

Test Content and Format: 6 scores: number learning, phonetic script, spelling clues, words in sentences, paired associates, total. First two parts involve oral presentation via a pre-recorded magnetic tape; last three parts do not require the use of a tape recorder. Long form is all 5 parts. Short form is only the last three parts. Last three parts are multiple choice. First two parts require listening and memorization of make-believe numbers and language auditorily and making correct responses to recorded message.

Administration Time: 30 min. (short) 60-70 min. (long)

Skills/Materials Required: Oral presentation, tape separate answer sheet, practice sheets, tape recorder, pencil (2), test booklet, practice sheet, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Based on percentile norms - total test and the short form. Different category scores measure different strengths. Score is the number right. Stencils used in scoring each for different pages and different responses. Raw scores are converted to percentile norms by grade equivalents and sex. Example: male student in ninth grade has total 79, percentile range of 40, standard error of measurement 37.5-42.5.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Most standardization groups (freshman, military and civilian personnel assigned to intensive foreign language training) are small; no norms for grade 12; percentile norms (sex separate) = grades 9, 10, 11. Original testing in 1958 to 1900 students beginning foreign language in grades 9-12 in 14 high schools and 1,300 students in colleges and universities.

Reliability: Split half coefficients are excellent exceeding .90 and .95.

Validity: High, correlations with grades and proficiency test scores.

References:

Carroll, J. B., & Sapon, S. M. (1959). Modern language aptitude test, New York: Psychological Corporation.

Cloos, R. (1971). A four-year study of foreign language aptitude at the high school level. Foreign Language Annuals, 4(4): 411-419.

Nagi Index of Disability

Publisher: Mershon Center
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Cost: Not for sale commercially.

Date of Publication: 1982 (Revised for Social Security Adm.)

Competencies Assessed: The extent to which disability is perceived as inability or limitations in performing social roles and activities in work, family, or independent living.

Population Characteristics: Ages 18-64.

Recommended Uses: Counseling and instruction in the work setting as well as in other social settings.

Test Content and Format: Fifteen questions for which answers constitute a 4-point scale (none, slight, moderate, severe). First seven items address physical performance, following three address psycho-physiological reactions and indicators of emotional performance, and the last four items relate to generalized symptoms which are believed to be manifestations of either/or both physical and emotional limitations. Could be self-administered. Respondent may be relative or friend.

Administration Time: 15 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: Nagi index, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores on each item were standardized and weighted through multiplication by corresponding factor coefficients. Standardized weighted scores were adjusted by adding a constant in order to eliminate negative values. None/minimal limitations = (0-1.99). Some limitations = (2-2.99), substantial limitations = (3-3.99). Severe limitations (4-7.99).

Norming/Standardization Practices: Data were collected through interviews with a probability sample of persons 18 and over yielding 6,493 completed schedules. All persons were noninstitutionalized. Interviews were conducted by trained interviewers on the field staff of Univ. of Michigan's Survey Research Center.

Reliability: The data yielded did not allow for comparisons between vocationally disabled and nondisabled sectors of the population.

Validity: Test purported that pathology and impairment accounted for variance in both physical and emotional performance. Computation of regression coefficients demonstrated that 59.7% on variance in physical performance and 45% of variance in emotional performance were accounted for by pathology and impairment, 38% of variance in work disability, 74% of dependence-independence in community living.

References:

Nagi, S. (1969). Disability and rehabilitation: Legal, clinical and self concepts and measurement, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Nagi, S. (1976). An epidemiology of disability among adults in the United States. Health and Society, 4, 57-61.

Nelson-Denny Reading Skills Test

Publisher: Riverside Publishing Co.
8420 Bryn Mawr Ave.
Chicago, IL 60631

Cost: $13.75

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Overall reading progress -- strengths, weaknesses, and special needs.

Population Characteristics: Secondary education, college, adult.

Recommended Uses: Prescribe, group, and plan as needed.

Test Content and Format: 136-item paper-pencil test of reading comprehension, vocabulary and reading rate. Test materials include special 26-minute cut-time norms for superior and speed readers. Examiner required and suitable for group use.

Administration Time: 35 min.

Skills/Materials Required: test booklet, examiner's manual, answer sheet.

Derived Scores/Information: Converted raw scores to derived scores by grade equivalents, percentile ranks, percentile bands, stanines, and normal curve equivalents.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization spanned a four-year period of time. Sample included about 3,800 students per grade and involved 57 school districts across five geographic regions. Sex-role bias in language was eliminated and normal curve equivalent scores for Title I (Chapter 1) were used.

Reliability: Split-half using Spearman-Brown formula ranged from .80-.93 for Word Meaning and Reading Comprehension. Word Parts subtests coefficients ranged from .77-.90. Total Reading ranged from .91-.94.

Validity: Diversity of writing styles and backgrounds of experiences and interests of children were reflected in passages. American Heritage Word Frequency Book (1971) was used to develop stimulus words and alternative answers.

References:

Brown, J., Bennett, M., & Harna, C. (1977). Nelson-Denny reading test forms E and F.

Robinson, H. A. (1965). Review of the Nelson Reading Test, revised edition. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements yearbook (p. 802). Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.

Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control-Adult Form

Publisher: Emory University
1364 Clifton Road NE
Atlanta, GA 30322

Cost: $5.00

Date of Publication: 1973

Competencies Assessed: To determine how much control an individual has over his/her life. And to what extent the individual is internally or externally rewarded.

Population Characteristics: Two forms: Children (8-18) and adults.

Recommended Uses: Counseling, therapy, instruction.

Test Content and Format: Consists of 40 items answered "yes" or "no." Items modified from children's form by changing "children" to "people" and changing tenses. Ex: "Do you think people can get their own way if they just keep trying?" Reading level of no higher than fifth grade. Group administration with instructions to answer honestly.

Administration Time: 20-30 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: Test/answer sheet, pencil

Derived Scores/Information: Item total-score correlations combined and averaged into external and external locus of control (e.g. controls within self versus controls outside of oneself.) Means and standard deviations given for grades 9, 10, 11, 12, college, and community. Grade 9: X=13.06, S.D. 3.98, Grade 10: X=13.02, S.D. 5.32, Grade 11: X=12.40, S.D. 5.02, Grade 12: X=11.81, S.D. 4.84, College: X=9.06, S.D. 3.89, Community: X=10.96, S.D. 5.61. Grade 9 (N=87), Grade 10 (N=115), Grade 11 (N=90), Grade 12 (N=87), College (N=154), and Community (N=33).

Norming/Standardization Practices: Three groups of college students (N=156) and a group of adults (N=33) from general community (suburb of large metro area in Southeastern United States). College students given credit in introductory psychology class. Members were middle and upper middle class (Hollings, 1957). Adults were voluntary community participants, were 26-30 years of age, and were predominantly members of upper-lower and lower-middle classes. All subjects were white. Eventually, studies totaled 12 with a total of 766 subjects.

Reliability: Split-half reliabilities ranged from .74-.86. This internal consistency underestimated because items were not arranged according to difficulty. For one group of college students, test-retest reliability for a six-week period was r=.83.

Validity: *Discriminant validity*: Two college groups (N=48, N=68) completed *Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability* scale and r=.10, df=47; r=.06, df=67) and not related to social desirability. correlation with *SAT* results for one group (N=48), r=.11 (consistent with children's version). *Convergent validity*: *Rotter* and *Nowicki* administered to two college groups and one adult group with these results (*r*=.68, *df*=47, *p*.01; *r*=.48, *df*=37, *p*.01). This suggests they measure the same construct but not in an identical way.

Comments: Externality suggests more maladjustment. Blacks submitted to more external controls within society scored in a significantly more external direction. Achievement for females related to externality which relates to Horner's "fear of success" in women.

References:

Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. (1973). A locus of control scale for non-college as well as college adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*.

Nowicki, S., & Strickland, B.R. (1972). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*.

Occupational Aptitude Survey and Interest Schedule (OASIS)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oaks Blvd.
Austin, TX 78735

Cost: $51

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: General ability, verbal aptitude, numerical aptitude, spatial aptitude, perceptual aptitude, and manual dexterity. Interests: artistic, scientific, nature, protective, mechanical, industrial, business detail, selling, accommodating, humanitarian, leading-influencing, physical performance.

Population Characteristics: Grades 8-12.

Recommended Uses: Career Development.

Test Content and Format: Aptitude: Numerical, spatial, and manual dexterity non-verbal; verbal and perceptual requires matching of words and phrases. Scores for 120 occupations. Interest: 240 items scored by Like, Dislike, or Neutral. May be administered to individuals, small groups, or complete classes.

Administration Time: 30 min. for each test (Aptitude and Interest).

Skills/Materials Required: Booklets, Answer Sheets, Profile Sheets, Manual, Scoring Stencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores are directly keyed to Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Guide for Occupational Exploration, and Worker Trait Group Guide.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Both tests normed on same national sample of 1,398 students from 11 states to allow for comparison of student performance across both tests.

Reliability: Aptitude: Median reliabilities range from .78-.90. Interest: Median alpha reliabilities range from .86-.94.

Validity: Aptitude: Similar to GATB factors and range from .60-.87. Interest: Construct validity determined through principal components analysis. Meets guidelines for sex fairness within validity constraints.

Reference:

Field, T., & Orgar, W. (1983). Measuring worker traits. Athens, GA: VDARE.

Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Cost: (1985) $72.50/complete set of test materials in two easel-kits, manual, and 25 record booklets; complete test kit in carrying case, $95.00; complete test kit (special edition - in durable plastic), $86.50; complete test kit (special edition) in carrying case, $108.50; manual, $6.00; individual record booklets, $7.75 for 1-4 pkgs, each, $7.00 for 5 or more pkgs, each; training audiocassette, $8.00; postage extra.

Date of Publication: 1970

Competencies Assessed: Wide-range screening measure of achievement in mathematics, reading recognition, reading comprehension, spelling, general information (science, social studies, the fine arts, and sports).

Population Characteristics: Grades K-12

Recommended Uses: In general, individual assessment of academic achievement employed in special education. Recommended for use with LD children who have difficulty expressing their answers in words since comprehension is pictorial and spatial. Provides an overview of an individual's scholastic attainment and assists the examiner in identifying possible areas of weakness for more detailed diagnostic reading.

Test Content and Format: 6 scores, 1 form, individual administration. Scoring takes place during administration. Items sequenced in order of difficulty. Only those within the student's functional range are administered.

Administration Time: 30-50 min. (untimed)

Skills/Materials Required: Volume 1 and 2 tests; manual; record booklets (answer booklets). Nonwritten responses (pointing to indicate response in three subtests, an oral response for the other two subtests. Optional items available: (1) Training Audiocassette (provides guide to acceptable pronunciation of words used in Reading Recognition and Spelling subtests) and (2) Special Plastic Edition (test plates printed on durable, wipe- clearn material).

Derived Scores/Information: Individual Record Booklet provides a presentation of derived developmental scores, including grade equivalents, grade percentile ranks, age equivalents, age percentile ranks, and standard scores by age or grade. For standard scores the test has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 points.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Students from the mainstream of education in public schools in the continental United States constituted the standardization sample. Except for those who happened to be in the mainstream classrooms that were sampled, special education students were excluded. Total sample was composed of 2,559 students - 200 from each grade (1-12), and 159 from kindergarten.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability coefficients (Pearson product-moment correlations) were calculated based on sample retesting of 50-75 students in Grades K,1,3,5,8, and 12. Reliability coefficients ranged from .42 in kindergarten for spelling to .94 in third grade for reading recognition. Overall median reliability coefficient was .78. In terms of median coefficient values the greatest confidence in stability is in the total test (.89) and reading recognition (.89) and least in reading comprehension (.64) and spelling (.65). Grade-level stability is greatest in Grades 1,5, and 8, with coefficients of .80 and lowest in kindergarten, with a coefficient of .74.

Validity: Rigorous item selection supports adequate content validity. Concurrent validity was calculated by comparing the scores of the PIAT to a measure of scholastic aptitude, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), Form A. Resultant product-moment correlation coefficients ranged from a median of .42 in kindergarten to a median of .69 in third grade. Range for the subtest coefficients ranged from .40 in spelling to a median of .68 in general information. Overall coefficient for the subtests of the PIAT with the PPVT, Form A, was .57.

Comments: Aside from minor criticisms related to isolated parts of the test and a weakness in basal-ceiling and validity procedures, the test is considered superior in its construction and standardization. Recommended to those who need an individually administered, wide ranging, detailed set of achievement tests of high quality.

References:

Scull, J.W., & Branch, L.H. (1980). The WRAT and the PIAT with learning disabled children. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13, 64-66.

Ysseldyke, J.E., Sabantino, D.A., & LaManna, J. (1973). Convergent and discriminant validity of the Peabody individual achievement test with educable mentally retarded children. Psychology in the Schools, 10, 200-204.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary (PPVT)

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publisher's Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Cost: $14.00/set of materials; $19.50/set of plastic materials; $3.65/50 ind. records; postage extra

Date of Publication: 1965

Competencies Assessed: Measure of receptive language

Population Characteristics: 2.5-18 yrs.

Recommended Uses: referral, instruction

Test Content and Format: 2 Forms: L & M picture recognition task: 175 test plates, each with 4 numbered pictures; examiner states stimulus word without prompting/cuing. Nonverbal, multiple-choice, individual administration, examinee must have adequate hearing. The two forms differ in words used. Pictures drawn clearly, no fine detail, no figure-ground problems. Children may point to correct response or examiner may point and examinee can designate by some type of signal. Cards are black/white. Easel may be used. Good for use with wide variety of exceptional children.

Administration Time: 10-15 min. (untimed)

Skills/Materials Required: Administration manual, book of plates, easel

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores can be converted to percentile, rank, mental age, or standard score. Deviation I.Q. - M = 100, S.D. = 15. Standard scores range from 40-160.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Representative national sample of 4,200 children, 2.5-18 yrs., 828 adults, ages 19-40 years - based on 1970 census data. 4,200 children, equally divided by sex, included within 21 age groups: groups at half-year intervals 2-6 to 6-11; one year intervals, 6 through 18. The sample was stratified by sex, geographic region, occupation of major wage earner, race, and community size. Adult sample: 19-25 yrs, 25-29 yrs, 30-34 yrs, and 35-40 yrs. groups were used. (stratified). Adults tested in group setting.

Reliability: Split-half Form L = .67 - .88, M = .80; Form M = .61 - .86 M = .81. Adult sample = .82; Alternate form: 642 children = .74 - .89, M = .81. Test/retest 962 children = .50 - .89, M = .76 (Form L and M within 9-31 days).

Validity: Correlations with intelligence tests = .20-.90, M = .60s. Difference with Stanford Binet/WISC-R considerable. Correlations with achievement tests = .00-.90, median = .40s.

Comments: Widely used measure of receptive language. Standard score should not be substituted for an I.Q.

References:

Dunn, L.M., & Dunn, L.M., (1981). Peabody picture vocabulary test-revised. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Zigler, E., Abelson, W.D., & Seitz, V. (1973). Motivational factors in the performance of economically disadvantaged children on the Peabody picture vocabulary test. Child Development, 44, 294-303.

Pennsylvania Bimanual Dexterity Work Sample

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Date of Publication: 1969

Competencies Assessed: Speed and dexterity in skills integrating the use of arms, hands, and fingers; eye-hand coordination.

Population Characteristics: Ages 16 and up.

Recommended Uses: Initial assessment of speech and dexterity.

Test Content and Format: Examinee must grasp a nut between the thumb and index finger, screw the nut onto a bolt held in the other hand, and put both into a hole in the board. 100 trials for assembly and disassembly.

Administration Time: 12 min.

Skills/Materials Required: 8" x 24" plastic test board, timer, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Assembly and disassembly tasks can be converted to percentile ranks and standard scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization was based upon a representative sample distributed among a number of reference groups, some with special characteristics such as visual handicaps.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: Due to the very simple nature of the task, the validity of this test is limited in predicting success on the job.

References:

Roberts, J. R. (1969). Pennsylvania bi-manual work samples. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service, Inc.

Personnel Tests for Industry (PTI) - Oral Directions Tests

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Date of Publication: 1954

Competencies Assessed: Selection and classification of industrial personnel. The wide range of mental ability assessed by the test makes it useful as a screening test in social agencies concerned with counseling adults.

Population Characteristics: Adults

Recommended Uses: Aids to employers in such personnel operations as the selection, placement, training, and promotion of individuals.

Test Content and Format: Students are presented designs on test/answer sheet. Instructions are given orally by recording. The examinee needs only to know the alphabet and numbers. Appropriate for group use. Examiner required. This test is particularly useful with illiterate populations.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Tape or phonograph record, answer sheets.

Derived Scores/Information: Total number correct of 39 is the total score. Raw scores to percentiles. Standard deviations for 699 women and 44 men were 2.5-6.9 and 4.7 to 8.0 respectively. Less variance in scores in homogeneous ability groups.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Test recorded and administered to 560 adults, together with Modified Alpha Examination Form 9. Persons whose answer sheets demonstrated failure to comprehend directions for Alpha test were eliminated from experimental data.

Reliability: Eight groups at varied ability, women (N = 699) and men (N = 444). Standard error of measurement was 2.1. Odd-even split-half scores with different standard deviations ranged from .82-.94.

Validity: Correlated .81 and .83 with verbal and numerical parts of Mod. Alpha Examination Form 9.

Reference:

Langmuir, C. (1954). *Personnel tests for industry - oral directions test*, New York: Psychological Corporation.

Pictorial Inventory of Careers

Publisher: Talent Assessment, Inc.
P. O. Box 5987
Jacksonville, FL 33247-5087

Date of Publication: 1980

Competencies Assessed: Interest in a wide variety of jobs.

Population Characteristics: Regular and low functioning vocational students.

Recommended Uses: Job placement.

Test Content and Format: Picture format, no reading skills are needed. Job areas assessed include: Agricultural/Environmental, Business-Data Processing, Retail/Sales, Secretarial, Communications-Art Graphics, Criminal Justice, Electrical/Electronics, Engineering Technology, Food Services, Health Services, Science Laboratory, Barber/Cosmetology, Fire Science, Personnel, Construction, Mechanical, Metal Trades.

Administration Time: Group administered in about 20 minutes.

Skills/Materials Required: Test kit.

Derived Scores/Information: Hand or computer scoring procedures provide scores for each subcomponent.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Details of norming procedures not described in manual.

Reliability: Data not available.

Comments: Types of jobs surveyed may not be appropriate for all geographic regions and levels of handicaps.

Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale

Publisher: Western Psychological Services (Manson Western Corporation)
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025
213/478-2061

Cost: Test Kit (25 test booklets, 25 profile forms, 1 scoring key, 2 computer answer sheets, 1 manual) $43.00.

Date of Publication: 1984 revision

Competencies Assessed: Measures self-concept for children and provides a global picture of personal satisfaction.

Population Characteristics: Grades 4-12

Recommended Uses: Identifies strengths and weaknesses in child's self-confidence. May also be used for research purposes and as a screening device for "at-risk" children as part of individual assessment battery.

Test Content and Format: 80 item paper-pencil test assessing six aspects of child's self-esteem; behavior, intellectual/school status, physical appearance/attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness and satisfaction. Written at third grade reading level, simple "yes/no" response format. May be self-administered.

Administration Time: 15-20 Min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, profile form, key, examinee, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile and stanine scores are provided for the total score and for each of the six subscales. Some items load on more than one cluster, "average" scores between 31st and 70th percentiles. Deviant scores = 1 S.D. from mean.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 1,183 Pennsylvania school children in grades 3-12, cluster scores from independent sample of 485 students. Significant mean and standard deviation not a function of grade. Collapsed across grades, X=51.84, S.D.=13.87. Twelve other studies of normal children, scores range from 51.8-6.14, S.D. 10.2-12.8. Cumulative N=3,692 was not broad-based or stratified. Generalization is not justified based on sample design. Normative scopes for specific groups also differ from original sample.

Reliability: Test-Retest = .62-.96 (Few weeks to six months) including normal, learning disabled, ethnic populations. Internal consistency-Alpha coefficients .90-.91, KR20=.88-.93. Also high internal consistency with special populations.

Validity: Personal Attribute Inventory for Children correlates .32 with Piers-Harris. Coopersmith Self Esteem correlates .85 with Piers-Harris.
Other validity studies are primarily correlational with other factors in person's life.

Comments: Not adapted for use with special populations, but dual modality (oral, visual) suggests modification for physically disabled, blind, deaf, and learning disabled students.

References:

Piers, E., & Harris, D. (1984). Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Wanat, P. (1983). Social skills: An awareness program with learning disabled adolescents. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16, 35-38.

Preschool Language Scale (PLS)

Publisher: Charles B. Merrill
1300 Alum Creek Dr.
Box 508
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Cost: $32.95

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: This scale measures receptive and expressive language abilities separately for more accurate diagnosis.

Population Characteristics: Infants - 7 years.

Recommended Uses: Provides system for assessment, diagnosis, and remediation of early developmental language problems in young children.

Test Content and Format: A verbal-visual test in which a picture book and program manual are used by an examiner to administer auditory and verbal language tasks. Not suitable for group use. Examiner required.

Administration Time: 20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Picture book, score sheet, manual

Derived Scores/Information: Basals and ceilings with age credits. Basal begins when all four items are passed; ceiling is none of four items passed. Point scores converted to age scores. Scores can be connected by formula to quotients. Ultimately compares language development age with chronological age. No means or standard deviations.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Head Start children in large urban areas, rural and urban children enrolled in child development and early childhood education programs, and children enrolled in middle class nursery schools. Currently, users may find development of local norms more valuable.

Reliability: Split-half, odd-even using Spearman-Borwn formula. Coefficients ranged from .75-.92 with a median of .88.

Validity: Item analysis shows item difficulty increases with sequence. Concurrent validity correlates at 82.5 with Illinois Test of Psycholinguistics and at .70 with Utah Test of Language Development. Non-verbal comparison with Columbia Mental Maturity Scale .67 and .68. Predictive validity was evidenced a year later when 65% of Head Start children were correctly identified with dichotomized scores with Lee Clark Reading Readiness Preschool Language Test.

References:

Wallace, G., & Kauffman, T. (1973). Teaching children with learning problems. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Zimmerman, I., Steiner, V., & Pond, R. (1979). Preschool language scale. Columbus, OH: Charles B. Merrill.

Prevocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (PACG)

Publisher: Exceptional Education
P.O. Box 15308
Seattle, WA 98115

Cost: $8.00 (Teacher's manual and 10 copies of the inventory, curriculum guide and profile sheet)

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: Worker behaviors, interaction skills and self-help skills that most supervisors consider important for entry into sheltered employment.

Population Characteristics: Handicapped persons who are preparing for sheltered employment.

Recommended Uses: (1) Assess and identify prevocational training needs. (2) Analyze behavior and skill deficits in terms of sheltered employment expectations. (3) Prescribe training goals and measure progress.

Test Content and Format: 46 items within nine subcategories: (1) attendance/endurance, (2) independence, (3) production, (4) learning, (5) behavior, (6) communication, (7) social skills, (8) grooming/eating, and (9) toilet. Items require the evaluator to answer questions about how the student behaves in different school or work settings.

Administration Time: 45 min.

Skills/Materials Required: May be administered by a paraprofessional or professional. Respondent must be familiar with the evaluator.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores reported on a "Percent of Workshop Level" for each of the nine subcategories.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 179 handicapped persons ranging in age from 10 to 60 years; diagnosed as profoundly, severely, and moderately mentally retarded. Many had additional handicaps. Sample drawn from state institutions, community habilitation centers, and public schools.

Reliability: A split-half reliability coefficient of .92 is reported.

Validity: Established in two surveys identifying worker behaviors and skills that community supervisors considered important. High correlation demonstrated between surveys (r = .83) was reported.

Comments: Excellent example of social validation survey methodology.

References:

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.), Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Mithaug, D. E., & Hagmeir, L. C. (1978). The development of procedures to assess prevocational competencies of severely handicapped young adults. AAESPH Review, 3, 94-115.

Mithaug, D. E., Mar, D. K., & Stewart, J. W. (1978). The prevocational assessment and curriculum guide. Seattle, WA: Exceptional Education.

Purdue Pegboard

Publisher: Science Research Associates
155 N. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Date of Publication: 1968

Competencies Assessed: Manipulative dexterity of right hand, left hand and both hands. The test measures both gross movements of hand, fingers, and arms as well as finger dexterity needed in small assembly work.

Population Characteristics: Children and adults.

Recommended Uses: Designed to assist in the assessment and training of employees in industrial jobs requiring manipulative dexterity such as assembly, packing, operation of certain machines, and other routine manual jobs of an exacting nature. Can be used to measure entering ability.

Test Content and Format: First, pins are inserted individually in small holes with the right hand, left hand, and both hands together, in successive trials. In another part of the test, pins, collars, and washers are assembled in each hole using both hands simultaneously.

Administration Time: 15-20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Pegboard, stopwatch, norms tables.

Derived Scores/Information: Score is the time required to complete the task; or the number of pins placed within a designated time limit. Scores are reported in percentiles for the right hand, left hand, both hands; and right, left, and both hands together.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms are available for a wide range of ages, handicapping conditions, and industrial settings.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: The function measured is very simple, and the validity for predicting job performance is not high.

Reference:

Tiffen, J. (1968). Purdue pegboard. Chicago: Science Research Association.

Raven Standard Progressive Matrices

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: Exam. Kit: Standard - $20
Colored - $21
Advanced (I, II) - $25

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Nonverbal mental abilities.

Population Characteristics: Ages 8-65 (Standard Kit)
Ages 5-11 (Colored Kit)

Recommended Uses: As a general measure of intelligence in a language-impaired population.

Test Content and Format: Five sets of twelve problems. Administered individually or in small groups. Multiple-choice format. Examinee is asked to select the appropriate design to complete the pattern. Require pattern analysis, analogy, alteration of pattern, permutations, or resolution of problem.

Administration Time: 40-60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, answer document, key, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentiles norms are available based on a sample of British school children; means and standard deviations for several adult groups have recently been developed.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardized using British children and adults. Norms based on 1947 data and available for ages 11-40. Original study done with 1,844 school children and adults. Norms for colored version based on 608 Scottish children.

Reliability: Coefficients range from .76 - .91. Test-retest reliability with children under seven, .65. Higher reliability with older populations based on small group study.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: Test is not a substitute for comprehensive mental abilities measure, but it may be a useful adjunct measure.

References:

Bradley, P. E., Battiu, R. R., & Sutter, E. G. (1979). Effects of individual and remediation for the treatment of learning disabilities. Clinical Neuropsychology, 1 (2).

Leong, C. K. (1980). Cognitive patterns of "retarded" and below-average readers. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 5, 101-117.

Raven, J. C. (1977). Raven progressive matrices. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Reading for Understanding Placement Test (RFU)

Publisher: Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 N. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Date of Publication: 1969

Competencies Assessed: Reading comprehension

Population Characteristics: Grades 3-8, 8-12, 5-16

Recommended Uses: Placement in the "Reading for Understanding" series.

Test Content and Format: 3 levels; designed for use with the self-teaching reading exercises prepared by the author, Thelma Gwinn Thurstone; Junior Edition (Grades 3-8); Senior Edition (Grades 8-12); General Edition (Grades 5-16)

Revised Beta Examination - Second Edition (Beta-II)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $4.50/25 test; .50 specimen; postpaid

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: Measures mental ability of nonreading applicants.

Population Characteristics: Persons ages 16-59; nonreading or low language.

Recommended Uses: Placement, program, instruction. Used for testing applicants in settings with large numbers of unskilled workers.

Test Content and Format: (Revision of Army Group Examination Beta) - nonlanguage. Six subsections are as follows: 1. Maze, 2. Digit symbol, 3. Error recognition, 4. Formboard, 5. Picture completion, 6. Identities. There are 123 items on the exam in the six separately timed paper-pencil tests. Directions are given orally to applicant. Examiner required. Suitable for group use. Available in Spanish.

Administration Time: 15 (30) min.

Skills/Materials Required: 1 form, revised manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores for each section are converted into weighted scores which are totaled. Total score (weighted) is converted to an IQ by age (X = 100, S.D. = 15). Percentile equivalents of sums of scale scores are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Original norms were based on performance of white, male, adult prisoners 1,225 inmates of Lewisburg Penitentiary, Lewisburg, PA. New norms: 1,050 persons, 16-64 years, stratified sample by age, sex, region of residence, race, and occupation.

Reliability: Conducted on a sample of 79 students (40 males and 39 females) aged 16-17 enrolled in large suburban school district in the south. Test-retest reliability = .91.

Validity: Correlations between first edition and Beta-II sums of scaled scores = .84 and .93. Correlations between Beta-II and WAIS IQs (18-19 years) = .64, (35-44) = .66.

Comments: Not normed on population intended to serve.

References:

Horn, J. M. (1983). The Texas adoption project: Adopted children and their intelligence resemblance to biological and adoptive parents. Child Development, 54, 268-275.

Kellogg, D. W., & Morton, N. N. (1978). Revised beta examination - Second edition (Beta-II)

Rule, W. R., & Jarrell, G. R. (1983). Intelligence and earliest memory. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56, 795-798.

Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (Locus of Control)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: Adult/H.S. College: pkg. 25/$6.00, pkg 100/$22.00

Date of Publication: 1965

Competencies Assessed: Protective test which reflects feelings about oneself and others. Identifies personal adjustment and maladjustment. Whether responses are conscious or unconscious is not clear, for example, wishes, desires, fears, and attitudes.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents/adults

Recommended Uses: Therapeutic intervention in form of counseling and/or support groups.

Test Content and Format: Written, self-completed "structured interview" of 40 sentence stems. It is a direct inquiry but places "distance" between examinee and examiner. Can be administered to any group size. Instructions are simple; examiner presents sentence stems.

Administration Time: 30 minutes with a minimum of experience or training, but it is actually self-paced with no time limit. Scoring time approximately 45 minutes.

Skills/Materials required: Pencil and test form.

Derived Scores/Information: Objectively scored by assigning empirically derived numerical value to each completed sentence. Responses sealed on basis of level of conflict/adjustment reflected on each statement. (1) omission, (2) conflict response, (3) positive response, (4) neutral response = conflict and positive statements weighted 1-3. Code is scaled 0-6 (higher=more negative) and summative adjustment may range 0-240. Average = 127, S.D. = 14, 135 is a cutoff for maladjusted. Qualitative analysis depends on user's clinical expertise and knowledge of test.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: Interscorer reliabilities (.96 = F, .91 = M) split-half reliabilities (.83 = F, .84 = M).

Validity: Predictive Validity: Screens delinquents, anxiety defenses, counselors, and drug user 60, 70, or 80% of time. Evidence presented of correlation with level of difficulty experienced by individuals going through new vocational experiences during mid-life career changes.

Comments: Structure of this test is both strength and weakness. Allows for quick synthesis of information but may lose valuable information obtained in other projective techniques. Requires skilled clinical judgment to interpret.

References:

Rotter, J.B., & Rafferty, J.E. (1950). Manual for the Rotter incomplete sentences blank: College form. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Rotter, J.B., Rafferty, J.E., & Schachtitz, E. (1965). Validation of the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Test. In B.I. Murstein (Ed.). Handbook of projective techniques. New York: Basic Books.

San Francisco Vocational Competency Scale (SFVCS)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: Scale booklet and manual available for $7.00

Date of Publication: 1968

Competencies Assessed: Motor skills, cognition, responsibility, and social-emotional behavior.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded adults.

Recommended Uses: Designed to rate mentally retarded adults for participation in sheltered workshops and other workshop programs.

Test Content and Format: Behavior rating scale comprises 30 items relating to four domains of vocational behavior.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Designed to be administered by paraprofessionals as well as professionals. Scale booklet and manual are the only materials necessary.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores for each item are summed, yielding a total vocational competency score.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Normative group made up of 562 mentally retarded sheltered workshop employees.

Reliability: Independent researchers report satisfactory reliability.

Validity: Validated by using school and sheltered workshop experiences as criteria. Predictive validity has not been examined.

References:

Kapes, J. T., & Mastie, M. M. (Eds.) (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.). Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Scales of Independent Behavior

Publisher: DLM Teaching Resources
One DLM Park
Allen, TX 75002
1-800-527-4742

Cost: Complete program $110.00
15 Response Booklet $20.00

Date of Publication: 1984

Competencies Assessed: Behaviors needed to function independently in home, social, and community settings.

Population Characteristics: Infancy through adults.

Recommended Uses: Diagnosis, instructional planning.

Test Content and Format: This is a test of adaptation and maladaptative behavior. Fourteen subscales measure motor skills, social communication skills, personal living skills, and community skills. Four maladaptative indices measure frequency and severity of problem behaviors.

Administration Time: 40-45 min. Individually administered.

Skills/Materials Required: Easel-style test book, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile ranks, standard scores, relative performance index, adjusted independent scores, and instructional range. Adaptive Behavior - means and standard deviations are a special transformation of Rasch ability scale; maladaptative behaviors have mean of 0 and standard deviation of 10.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Data collected from a stratified random sample of 1700 subjects drawn from over 40 communities selected on the basis of census statistics to approximate closely community size, geographic location, ethnic composition, sex, socioeconomic characteristics in United States population. Normative data gathered from infancy through mature adult levels (40+ years of age). Additional technical data obtained on over 1,000 handicapped and nonhandicapped people including extensive samples of retarded, learning disabled, behavior disordered, and hearing impaired subjects.

Reliability: Internal consistency coefficients (split-half corrected for length by Spearman-Brown formula) = .76 (nonhandicapped) and .80s and .90s (handicapped). Test-retest coefficients on two elementary school age samples (one to four week period) were in .80s and .90s.

Validity: Correlations with age = .90s; correlates positively to Woodcock-Johnson cognitive ability scales with N=665 at three age levels. General maladaptative index showed significant problem behaviors with behavior-disordered sample.

Comments: Maturational affect observable in indexes at adolescent-adult level where prevalence of problem behaviors drops significantly. Adaptive behavior scales provide real-life information in conjunction with cognitive ability.

References:

Bruininks, R., Woodcock, R., Hiu, B., & Weatherman, R. (1984). Scales of Independent Behavior. Allen, TX: DLM Teaching Resources.

Singer Vocational Evaluation System (VES)

Publisher: The Singer Educational Division
80 Commerce Drive
Rochester, NY 14623

Cost: Individual work stations range from $1,150.00 to $2,190.00

Date of Publication: 1977-81

Competencies Assessed: Vocational aptitude, interests, and work tolerance.

Population Characteristics: 17-30 year olds, special needs population.

Recommended Uses: Provides both vocational assessment and occupational exploration.

Test Content and Format: Consists of a series of 24 work sampling stations which represent the most common jobs found in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Utilizes an audiovisual teaching machine to present programmed instructions.

Administration Time: Approximately 3 weeks; samples are usually administered selectively (the average number of samples is 5 to 7 per client).

Skills/Materials Required: Training is not required, but is available. Tools and equipment are self-contained in a carrel (with the exception of large equipment). Many of the stations use expendable items ranging between 18¢ and $8.66.

Derived Scores/Information: Task Observation Record, Work Activity Rating Form, Methods-Time-Measurement (MTM) Rating Form, Industrial Rating Form and a summary of time and quality scores. There is no recommended final report format.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Each unit contains client norms, employer worker norms, and MTM. All norm groups are of adequate size and sample Characteristics are thoroughly described.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability coefficients of .61 and .71 are reported for an EMR population.

Validity: Validity is based on several sources. Content validity of the job-task matrix and job analysis for each sample indicates that the average work station covers about 65% of the tasks given in the matrix. Two predictive studies relate work sample scores with success in jobs related to the work samples.

Comments: The system provides a measure of interest measurement and skill assessment from jobs primarily in the skilled trades and technical areas.

References:

Botterbush, K. F. (1980). A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Botterbush, K. F. (1985). Norms, reliability and validity in commercial vocational evaluation systems: A critical review. In C. Smith & R. Fry (Eds.), National forum on issues in vocational assessment: The issue papers (pp. 24-32). Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Kapes, J. T., & Mastie, M. M. (Eds.) (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1985). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.). Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)

Publisher: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing
1602 Coronado Dr.
Champaign, IL 61820

Cost: $4.00/50 profiles 2.50/specimen kit
1.50/manual Postage extra
9.95/handbook 1.75 or less - daily scoring service/Test
1.10 or less - weekly scoring service/Test

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Personality types.

Population Characteristics: Ages 16 and over - useable with illiterate/bilinguals.

Recommended Uses: Designed to assess a variety of personality traits. Intelligence scale designed to assess combination of "fluid" and "crystalized" intelligence (general intelligence).

Test Content and Format: 15 self-report personality scales and one general intelligence scale. Some examples of personality factors include reserved vs. humble vs. assertive, sober vs. happy-go-lucky. Each pole of the 16 Bi-Polar Scales is described by adjectives or phrases to which examinees responds.

Administration Time: 50-60 min. = A&B 20-30 min. Form E (oral)
30-40 min. = C&D

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, handbook, profiles, answer sheets, administration, scoring key.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores standardized on point scale average at 4 and 7. Scores can be translated into percentiles. Separate tables for students and adult population.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Most positive aspect. Normed on college, H.S., adult populations. Samples ranged from 229 subjects to 5077 subjects. Form E is based on norms from a culturally disadvantaged sample of rehabilitation clients.

Reliability: Frequently low. Some forms have higher reliability than others. Forms A&C/B&D combined scales = .35-.79 (M = .60). Test-retest (intervals of 2-7 days) (A+B) .45-.93 (M = .81); (B,L,M,N and Q_1) = .70; (C+D) .67-.86 (M = .78); M,N,Q_2 = .70; (A+B) 2 month test/retest .63-.88 (M = .78).

Validity: The 16PF is based on an extensive program of research. Factor analyses provide evidence of construct validity. Predictive validity results are available for a variety of application.

References:

Cattell, R., Eber, H., & Tatsuoka, M. (1976). Sixteen personality factor questionnaire handbook. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Strauch-Rahauser, G., Schafheutle, R., Lipke, R., & Strauch, M. (1977). Measurement problems in long-term dialysis patients. Journal of Psychosomatic Research(England), 21(1), 49-54.

Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability

Publisher: WPS
12031 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Cost: $117.50 for a complete set (4 forms)
$ 34.50 per form

Date of Publication: 1962-1980

Competencies Assessed: Measures relative strengths and weaknesses in perceptual motor functions affecting receptive and expressive language skills.

Population Characteristics: Grades 1-6.

Recommended Uses: Screening for Specific Language disability.

Test Content and Format: Individual or group administered. 4 forms corresponding to grade levels. Each form contains 8 subjects: coping from far point, copying from near point, visual-perception-memory linkage, visual discrimination, visual perception-memory-kinesthetic linkage, auditory-perception-memory linkage, auditory-perception-kinesthetic linkage, and auditory-visual linkage. An individual auditory perception and memory test and a general orientation to space and time test are also included.

Administration Time: 1 1/2 hours.

Skills/Materials Required: Test Kit, test booklet, manual, technical manual.

Derived Scores/Information: All responses to the subtest items are scored as correct or incorrect and analyzed for error types. Case histories are provided to illustrate the type of analysis suggested. Test profiles are also provided.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Unnormed to allow for flexibility in interpretation depending upon each child's background and life experiences. Guidelines for interpretation are included in the manual. Local norm development is encouraged.

Reliability: Studies of N = 200 were used to establish reliability. Test-retest (30 day interval) = .71 - .85 for overall test and .20 - .62 for individual subtests. Interrater reliability = .69 - .78. Internal consistency = .94 - .96.

Validity: Concurrent validity studies with the CTBS produced correlation coefficients of .53 - .86.

Comments: Absence of national norms and questionable reliability place serious limitations on the use of this test. Age range inappropriate to transition population.

Reference:

Burns, W. J., & Burns, K. A. (1977). The Slingerland screening tests: Local norms. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *10*, 450-454.

Slingerland, B. (1980). *Slingerland screening test for identifying children with specific language disability*. Beverly Hills, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT)

Publisher: Slosson Educational Publications, Inc.
140 Pine Street
East Aurora, NY 14052

Cost: $9.00/manual, 20 score sheets, 20 copies Oral Reading; 1.75/20 score sheets; 1.75/20 IQ classification charts; post paid

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Intelligence (brief) designed to be used by untrained examiners/heavy emphasis on language skills

Population Characteristics: 2 weeks - 27 years

Recommended Uses: A brief measure of intellectual functioning as a guide to educational placement, programming, and instruction.

Test Content and Format: 194 untimed items: birth - CA1 = 23 items
CA1 = 24
CA2 = 12
CA3 = 12
CA4 = 12
CA5-15=6 items each
CA16-26 = 4 " "
CA27 = 1 item

Individually administered. Above 4 years of age, all questions presented verbally and require spoken language responses. Questions under the age of four require observation of and demonstration by the examinee, for example, Where is the chair? Where are the legs of the chair? Questions for children over the age of four require verbal responses from the examinee, for example, How many apples am I drawing? A hat goes on your head. Shoes go on your __________.

Administration Time: 10-30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: administration, examinee, pen/pencil, score sheet/manual

Derived Scores/Information: Ratio I.Q., M = 100, standard deviations vary considerably throughout the age range covered by scale.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample was composed of children and adults from both rural and urban populations in NY state; no demographics are included. N=1,109 persons ranging in age from 2-18.

Reliability: Test-retest coefficient (within 2-month period of time) = .97. N=139

Validity: Correlates .76 - .90 with Stanford-Binet. Correlates .70 with Cattell Infant Intelligence Scale.

Comments: Best used as screening device - not a substitute for Wechsler or Binet.

References:

Slosson, R. (1961). Slosson intelligence test, East Aurora, N.Y.: Slosson Locational Publications, Inc.

Social Network Checklist

Publisher: B. Bradford Brown
Department of Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
5848 S. University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: Measures how persons deal with a variety of situations in daily living and where they seek help in dealing with situations

Population Characteristics: Adults (ages 20-70)

Recommended Uses: Providing appropriate education and support systems/networks based on one's demographic background, personality, social relationships, and attitudes.

Test Content and Format: In interview fashion, respondents are asked if they are experiencing any of 16 "events" (transitions or crises) and are asked if they are experiencing any of 10 role-related "strains". Respondents answer on Likert-type scale "somewhat," "very," etc. If either response is "somewhat" or "very bothered," the respondent is asked about where and from when he/she seeks assistance. "Strains" responses run from "high" to "low": low=1, high=4. Other Likert scales inform about social resources. Respondents who do not seek help respond to one of six reasons.

Administration Time: 30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Checklist, pen/pencil

Derived Scores/Information: Within each of four roles (workers, money managers, spoUses, and parents), the coping items were factor analyzed; along with mean score on role-specific strain items, factors were entered in stepwise regression on mean score of role-specific stress items. Using regression equations, four role-coping scores were calculated, weighted, and summed. Scores were standardized so that values above or equal to zero represented effective coping repertoire, below zero, .

Norming/Standardization Practices: Based on longitudinal study, base (1972) and follow-up (1976) interviews with 1,106 Chicago area adults aged 20-70. Analyses came from sample of 606 who had encountered one or more troublesome life changes in four years.

Reliability: No information found

Validity: No information found

Comments: This checklist is an attempt to make comparisons between those who seek help and those who don't.

References:

Hammer, M. (1963). Influence of small social networks as factors on mental health hospital admissions. Human Organization, 22, 243-251.

Pearlin, L., & Schooler, C. (1963). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19(1), 2-21.

Social Performance Survey Schedule

Publisher: M. R. Lowe
Psychological Service Center
Department of Psychology
Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130

Cost: No cost.

Date of Publication: 1978 (unpublished)

Competencies Assessed: To assess numerous behaviors that constitute overall social performance.

Population Characteristics: Junior high to adult.

Recommended Uses: Program planning and monitoring progress.

Test Content and Format: The test consists of 100 items/traits/behaviors possessed by an individual. A 5-point Likert Scale is used to rate the items from "not at all" to "very much." There are 50 positive and 50 negative items is the survey. Positive items are referred to as Part A; negative items as Part B. They are intermingled throughout the test.

Administration Time: 15-20 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test

Derived Scores/Information: Two methods, unadjusted and adjusted. Unadjusted assumes authors' definition of social performance. Part A optimum behaviors have highest rating of 4; Part B least optimum behaviors have highest rating. Two subscale scores result with a maximum total SPSS score of 400. Adjusted method utilizes panel of judges from population to give definitions to social performance. The mean scores arrived at by judges are used to adjust scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 303 undergraduate and graduate students taking psychology courses at Boston College. Females rated themselves as having higher social performance, greater frequency of performance, and less negative behavior.

Reliability: Test-retest = .87 unadjusted and .86 adjusted. Internal consistency was calculated utilizing coefficient alpha. Coefficients respectively = .94 and .88.

Validity: Pearson correlations between SPSS and Social Avoidance and Distress Scale (SAD) were -.42 (unadjusted) and -.38 (adjusted). A moderate universe relationship exists between social performance and social anxiety.

Reference:

Lowe, M., & Caritela, J. (1979). A self-report measure of social skill. *Behavior Therapy*. *9*, 535-544.

Social and Prevocational Information Battery (SPIB) (SPIB-T)

Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Cost: $15/20 hand scored tests, $19/20 machine scored tests, $2.50/technical report, $5/specimen set, postage extra - compuScan scoring service, $.55 and over per test.

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: Assesses an educable mentally handicapped student's knowledge of skills and competencies important for community adjustment.

Population Characteristics: Educable mentally retarded (IQ 55-75) Grades 7-12.

Recommended Uses: Measurement of life skills/evaluation of programs for each student.

Test Content and Format: 277 Item paper-pencil test, orally administered, consisting of 9 subtests: job-search skills, job-related behavior, banking, budgeting, purchasing, home management, physical health care, hygiene/grooming, and functional signs. Students' response to each item is either true-false or picture selection. Tests skills for independent living curriculum-based. Examiner required. Suitable for groups smaller than 20.

Administration Time: 15-25 min. per subtest.

Skills/Materials Required: Machine and hand scorable test book, manual with key, user's guide, class record sheet, test reviewer's guide.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted to percentage/percentile ranks.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Developed with 700 junior and 1,100 senior high EMR participants in Oregon - Caucasian population, sexes equally divided, reference group of 453 of each level, ages 14-20 yrs.

Reliability: Subtest reliability coefficients range from .65 to .82; Battery reliability - .94-.93. Reliability for some of scale scores is insufficient for individual use but adequate for group use. Sufficient total battery reliability for use in selection/placement of individuals.

Validity: Tentative claims of validity made in technical report. Measures information only and not actual competence.

Reference:

Halpern, A., Raffeld, P., Irvin, L. K., & Link, R. (1975). *Social and prevocational information battery*. New York: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

SRA Computer Operator Aptitude Battery

Publisher: SRA
155 N. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Cost: Set of 5 = $86.00 (1-19) - Test Booklets
Set of 5 = $52.00 (1-19) - Answer sheets

Date of Publication: 1974

Competencies Assessed: Designed to predict job performance of computer operators and identify potential computer operators.

Population Characteristics: High school students and adults - Reading skill required.

Recommended Uses: Career aptitude assessment and career.

Test Content and Format: Consists of three separate tests: Sequence Recognition, Format Checking, and Logical Thinking. Sequence Recognition requires the examinee to order the sequence numerically. Format Checking is a multiple choice and requires the examinee to follow specific format rules to be applied generally. Logical Thinking is multiple choice.

Administration Time: 10, 5, and 30 minute tests - timed exactly. 87 minutes total.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, answer sheet, 2 soft-leaded pencils.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores converted to percentile scores. Each test scored separately by counting correct responses. Norms available for total test score and subtest scores. Total battery score most useful in evaluating potential.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Initial study included 5 institutions contributing a total of 148 employed computer operators. Percentile norms available for experienced computer operators and inexperienced applicants or trainers. Norms based on 282 personnel from a variety of organizations in the U.S. Included information about sex, age, and education.

Reliability: Sequence Recognition alternate form reliability = .77 and .75. Format Checking test-retest = .77, Logical Thinking K-R 20 odd-even with Spearman-Brown correction = .94, and total battery K-R 21 =.95.

Validity: Three-test battery showed validation and cross validation correlations of .44 and .32 with ability to perform the test and showed initial validation correlation of .47 with potential for learning computer programming.

Reference:

Holloway, J. (1974). *Computer Operator Aptitude Battery*. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates, Inc.

SRA Reading-Arithmetic Index

Publisher: Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 No. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, Il 60606 (312) 984-2000

Cost: $18.10

Competencies Assessed: Assesses general reading and computational achievement for those over 14 years old.

Population Characteristics: 14 - adult.

Recommended Uses: For entry-level positions and training programs where basic skills of applicants are often too low to be reliably evaluated by typical selection tests.

Test Content and Format: Two paper-pencil self-scoring tests measuring reading skills (picture-word association), word decoding, comprehension of phrases, sentences, and paragraphs and arithmetic skills (addition and subtraction, multiplication and division, fractional operations, decimals and percentages). Suitable for group use. Many of the tests assume levels of proficiency above those actually required by the jobs for which they are being used.

Administration Time: 25 minutes per index.

Skills/Materials Required: Examiner required, manual, test booklet.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores reflect highest developmental level passed. Scores are represented in raw frequencies, percentiles, means, and standard deviations. Scores are based on correct responses in various levels. Scores can be examined as subscores or total raw scores. Criterion demands that examinee answer correctly at least 50% more of the items in section than expected by chance.

Norming/Standardization Practices: A total of 675 males and females enrolled in special- and adult-education programs in Colorado and South Carolina were administered one of three experimental forms and the SRA Pictorial Reasoning Test. Norms are for special education and industry.

Reliability: Final form administered to 87 males and females enrolled in a combination program of on-the-job training and basic education in Chicago (17-30 yrs.). Split-half (KR-20) coefficient .87. Split-half correlations for each of the indexes ranged from .91-.95. Inter correlation tp SRA Pictorial Reasoning Test on national sample of 2488 twelfth graders .16.

Validity: Correlations to job criterion (Reading-middle .50's and Arithmetic-.30's and .40's) Manual indicates this test is best used as a screening tool for job applicants.

References:

Science Research Associates, Inc. (1986). SRA Reading and Arithmetic Indexes. Chicago, IL. Science Research Associates, Inc.

Science Research Associates, Inc. (1972). Validation: Procedures and Results. Chicago, IL. Science Research Associates, Inc.

SRA Verbal Form

Publisher: Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 N. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

Cost: $5.95/25 tests; postage extra; $.40/manual; $1.25/specimen

Date of Publication: 1973

Competencies Assessed: "To furnish an objective index of student intelligence."

Population Characteristics: Grades 7-16 and adults

Recommended Uses: Use in conjunction with other intelligence measures for placement, programming, and instruction

Test Content and Format: Formerly SRA Verbal Classification Form. 3 scores: quantitative, linguistic, and total. Abbreviated version of Thurstone Test of Mental Alertness. Self-administered, individual or group. Blocks of seven items: 2 same-opposite, one arithmetic reasoning, two vocabulary recall, and two number series items. 84 items. Rapid shift from one type of program to another - speed important. Cash means the same or opposite of _____price _____refund _____money _____bank

Administration Time: 15 min. timed

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, hard lead pencil, a sheet of scratch paper.

Derived Scores/Information: Three scores are available: Total score, L-score (linguistic ability) and Q-score (quantitative thinking). Standard scores can be converted to centile ranks, quotient ranks, and stanine ranks. Conversion tables are limited by sample number.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Percentile norms were developed using 3,820 H.S. students (9 H.S. scattered across country). 223 production employees in industrial settings, and 1237 female clerical employees.

Reliability: Students - split-half high = .705.

Validity: Correlates highly with overall grades (.63) with school subjects demanding general ability (science = .56, English = .47). Clerical group-test-criterion correlations uniformly low but generally statistically significant (3 of 6 criteria correlated in low .20s, 3 below .13).

References:

Phillips, R. M. (1969). A multiple regression study of academic prediction at Gallaudet College. Doctoral thesis. University of Maryland, College Park.

Thurstone, T. G., & Thurstone, L.L. (1946). Thurstone test of mental alertness. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates. Chicago, IL.

Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), 1973 Edition

Publisher: The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $1.25/instructional objectives (one form of any one level); $6.40/ 100 practice tests; $1.50/administrator's guide; $3.00/teachers guide; $4.95/technical report; $2.95/specimen set of any one level; postage extra. NCS scoring stencils and services available from NCS Interpretive Scoring Systems.

Date of Publication: 1975 (1964 edition still available)

Competencies Assessed: Subtests in mathematics and reading available as separates; partial batteries are available without science, social science, and listening comprehension (grades 2.5-6.9), without science and social science (grades 7.0-9.5).

Population Characteristics: Children, grades 1.5-2.4, 2.5-3.4, 3.5-4.4, 4.5-5.4, 5.5-6.9, 7.0-9.5.

Recommended Uses: The test focus on those subject and skill areas which are generally considered basic for most elementary, middle, and junior high schools.

Test Content and Format: 6 levels, 1-2 forms, number of tests in the various levels ranges from 6 to 11. Group administration. Paper and pencil test.

Administration Time: Grades 1.5-2.4 - 250 minutes in 4 sessions; Grades 2.5-3.4 - 340 minutes in 6 sessions; Grades 3.5-4.4 - 380 minutes in 6 sessions; Grades 4.5-5.4 - 405 minutes in 7 sessions; Grades Grades 5.5-6.9 - 405 minutes in 7 sessions; Grades 7.0-9.5 - 315 minutes in 9 sessions.

Skills/Materials Required: Administrator's guide; technical report; practice test and directions for primary levels 1, 2, 3, and intermediate levels 1-2; film strips and tape cassettes or records available for teacher training; separate answer sheets (Digitek, IBM 805, IBM 1230, MRC, NCS folders); may be used in grades 4.5-9.5; supplementary NCS directions for primary levels 1-3. The four sound filmstrips, called Stanford Strategies, deal with reasons for using the test, procedures for administering it, interpretation of the test scores, and using the test results to improve instruction and learning.

Derived Scores/Information: Four types of norms are provided: percentiles, stanines, grade equivalents, and scaled scores.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms are based on a sample of 275,000 students in 109 school systems in 43 states. Norms sample closely matches characteristics of the national population. No separate norms are given for boys and girls, for geographical region, for type of community, or for socioeconomic status.

Reliability: Technical data report for 1973 edition presents split-half and K-R 20 reliability coefficients for each test at each level, for beginning, middle, and end of the grade for which each level is most appropriate. Of the 668 coefficients reported, 428, or 64 percent, are .90 or above. Only 30, and all of these in Primary 1 or 2 batteries, are below .80.

Validity: Has been criticized for not giving sufficient detail in the area of content validity.

Comments: The SAT is a norm-referenced test from which criterion/objectives-referenced interpretations can be made. Attempts have been made to make the tests acceptable to representation of minority group interests; however, no technical data are provided to indicate the consequences of these efforts to attend to the particular needs of racial and ethnic minorities and urban populations. An index of instructional objectives for each form and level provides a description of the behavior presumably measured by each item and enables comparison with local curriculum objectives. Thus, the indexes are useful in enabling test users to ascertain the local validity of the battery above and beyond the general content validity.

References:

Balow, I. H., & Brill, R. G. (1975, April). An evaluation study of reading and academic achievement levels of 16 graduating classes of the California School for the Deaf, Riverside. Volta Review, 77(4), 255-266.

Jensema, C. J. (1975, February). A note on the achievement test scores of multiple handicapped hearing impaired children. Am Ann Deaf, 120(1), 37-39. (PA54:1945)

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test--Fourth Edition

Publisher: Riverside Publishing Co.
Chicago, IL 60606

Cost: $299 per kit

Date of Publication: 1985

Competencies Assessed: General intelligence, verbal reasoning, abstract visual reasoning, quantitative reasoning, and short term memory.

Population Characteristics: Children ages 2 through 18.

Recommended Uses: As a measure of general intelligence and cognitive strengths and weaknesses to assist in differential diagnosis between mental retardation and specific learning disabilities; to identify learning problems, and to identify gifted students.

Test Content and Format: 15 subtests presented in an individually administered easel format; subtests are both verbal and nonverbal.

Administration Time: 40-90 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test kit, stop watch, scratch paper, pencil, test manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Standard scores (X=50; S.D.=8) for each subtest. Standard scores (X=100; S.D.=16) for the 4 area scores (verbal reasoning, abstract visual reasoning, quantitative reasoning, short term memory) and the overall test composite.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Nationally standardized on a sample of over 2,000 children stratified according to the 1980 census. Special studies include a variety of handicapping conditions.

Reliability: Subtests report reliabilities of .62-.87. Area scores: .74-.96. Test composite: .93-.99.

Validity: Factor analytic data partially substantiate the theoretical construct of intelligence upon which one test is based. No other validity data are available at this time.

Comments: Recently released, the test shows much promise for use with special populations.

References:

Thorndike, R. L., Hagen, E., & Sattler, J. (1985). The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test - Fourth edition. Chicago: Riverside.

Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $4.50/Specimen set (specify red, green brown, or blue level); postage extra; Red Level - Grades 1.5-3.5 - $12.50/35 hand-scored tests; $14.95/35 MRC-scored tests; $3.50/set of hand-scoring stencils; MRC-scoring service, 90¢ and over/test; Green Level - Grades 2.5-5.5 - prices same as for a Brown Level - Grades 4.5-9.5 - $12.50/35 hand-scored tests; $7.70/35 MRC answer folders; $3.50/35 hand-scored answer folders; $2.75/set of hand-scoring stencils MRC serving service, 85¢ and over/test; Blue level - $14.50/35 tests; $8.00/35 answer booklets; $3.25 per set of scoring stencils; $3.00/specimen set; scoring service, available.

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Measures major components of the reading process. Red Level - Grades 1.5-3.5; 6 scores; Word reading, comprehension, total, auditory vocabulary, auditory disciplination, phonetic analysis; Green Level - Grades 2.5-5.5: 7 scores: auditory vocabulary, auditory discrimination, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, comprehension (literal, inferential, total); Brown Level - Grades 4.5-9.5: 7 scores: auditory vocabulary, comprehension (literal, inferential, total), phonetic analysis, structural analysis, reading rate; Blue Level - Grades 9-13: 12 scores: comprehensional literal, inferential, total), vocabulary (word meaning, word parts, total), decoding (phonetic analysis, structural/analysis, total), rate (scanning and skimming, fast reading, total)

Population Characteristics: Grade 1.5-3.5, 2.5-5.5, 4.5-9.5, 9-13 (high school and community college level).

Recommended Uses: Designed to provide particularly accurate assessment of low-achieving students, diagnosing their specific strengths and weaknesses in reading. Red Level can also be used for low achievers in grades 3 and over: Green Level for low achievers in grades 5 and over, and Brown Level for low achievers in grades 9 and over.

Test Content and Format: 4 levels; 2 forms; 2 editions (hand scored, MRC scored) for grades 1.5-5.5. Multiple item, paper-pencil test.

Administration Time: Red Level - Grades 1.5-3.5; 150 minutes in 3-5 sessions; Green Level - Grades 2.5 - 5.5; 165 minutes in 3-5 sessions; Brown Level - Grades 43.5-9.5; 113 minutes in 1-5 sessions; Blue level - Grades 9-13; information not available.

Skills/Materials Required: Red level - Grades 1.5-3.5 - Forms A and B, manual; Green Level - Grades 2.5-5.5 - Forms A and B, manual; Brown Level - Grades 4.5-9.5 - Forms A and B, manual, separate answer folders (MRC, hand scored) must be used; Blue Level - Grades 9-13 - Forms A and B consist of 2 parts: reusable test booklet and MRC test -answer booklet, manual. Forms A and B are alternate and equivalent forms.

Derived Scores/Information: Norm-referenced scores include percentile ranks, stanines, grade equivalents, class group norms, and scaled scores. Content-references scores include raw scores and progress indicators.

Norming/Standardization Practices: In 1975 the SDRT standardization sample for the Red, Green, and Brown Levels of SDRT was chosen to be representative of the national school population. School systems were selected by means of a stratified random sampling technique, and two samples of school districts were selected. Sample 1 consisted of 23 school districts testing approximately 25,000 students in grades 2-9. Sample 2 contained 22 school districts testing about 6,500 students in grades 3 and 5.

For the Blue Level of SDRT, two standardization programs were conducted: (1) a high school standardization sample in 1972 consisted of 20 school systems testing approximately 24,000 students in grades 9-12, and (2) a junior/community college standardization sample consisted of 11 colleges testing about 2,500 first-year students. Samples were representatives of high school and junior/community college populations, respectively.

Reliability: K-R 20 reliabilities range from .79 to .98 for the various subtests across levels, with a vast majority of coefficients exceeding .90. Intersubtest correlations for the most part fall substantially below reliabilities, suggesting some degree of independence among skills measured by subtests.

Validity: Two types of validity were investigated: content validity and criterion-related validity. In terms of content validity, stated test objectives seem to reflect the essential reading skills measured by SDRT. The manual states that individual schools, however, must determine the validity of SDRT for measuring their own objectives by inspecting the test's content and matching it to the local objectives. Criterion-related validity information was obtained during the standardization phase, in which students also took Form A of the Reading Test of Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK). Tables in manual contain summary data and intercorrelations for Form A of the SDRT subtests and Literal and Inferential Comprehension raw scores and correlations of these scores with the Reading Test of the Stanford TASK.

Comments: Considerable attention is given in the manual to the use of test results. SDRT provides useful test information to teachers without special training in diagnosis and remediation. Statistically linked with the Stanford Achievement Test Series.

Reference:

Leton, D. A. (1974). The structure of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test in relation to the assessment of learning disabled pupils, *Psychology in the Schools*, 3(1), 40-47.

Stanford Test of Academic Skills (also called Stanford TASK-First Edition

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 70204-0952

Cost: $12.75/35 tests; answer sheets; $3.00/35 Digitek or IBM 1230, $2.50/35 IBM 805, $11.00/100 MRC; $13.00/100 NCS; scoring stencils; $2.00/set of Digitek, IBM 805 or IBM 1230, $1.00/MRC hand; $1.25/index of instructional objectives; $1.25/manual; 35¢/NCS directions; $5.00/specimen set for high school (both levels) and for college specimen set (specify Level I and II or Level II College); postage extra; Digitek or IBM scoring service, 80¢/test; MRC scoring service, 50¢/test; NCS scoring service, 40¢/test

Date of Publication: 1975

Competencies Assessed: Assesses school achievement in the areas of reading, English, mathematics

Population Characteristics: Grades 8-10, 11-12, and grade 13 in junior/community college

Recommended Uses: Most appropriately give at the beginning of the fall term since percentile ranks and stanines are provided for the beginning of each grade level and used in placement and programming.

Test Content and Format: 3 scores; 2 forms; 3 levels; Level 1 - Grades 8-10; Level 2 - Grades 11-12; and Grade 13 in junior/community college; reading test has 2 parts: Part A (comprehension) and Part B (vocabulary). English test has 3 parts: Part A (use of reference sources), Part B (identification of grammar, etc. errors), and Part C (spelling). Mathematic test is a broad survey of standard mathematics skills. Multiple item paper-pencil test. Materials include two alternate and equivalent forms, A and B. Group administration.

Administration Time: 120 (140) min. in 3 sessions

Skills/Materials Required: manual; index of instructional objectives; answer sheets; supplemental directions; scoring stencils.

Derived Scores/Information: Norm-referenced scores include percentile ranks, stanines, grade equivalents, scaled scores, normal curve equivalents, and content cluster analysis.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Over 17,000 students in 19 schools chosen as representative were administered the test along with the Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test to provide a common norms base for comparing achievement and scholastic aptitude. Later, tests were administered to students in 32 schools in 29 states.

Reliability: Reliabilities for all TASK tests areas substantial, with K-R 20s running consistently above .90 (.92 to .95). Correlations for all three TASK subtests and the Otis-Lennon deviation IQ were relatively high with coefficients running in the .80 to .85 range.

Comments: In general, for a broad-range achievement test in basic academic skills, TASK is relatively well constructed.

Street Survival Skills Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Publisher: McCarron-Dial Systems - Common Market Press
P.O. Box 45628
Dallas, TX 75245
(214) 247-5945

Cost: $137.50 plus shipping/handling; score forms $9.00/pkg 50; planning charts $5.00/pkg 50.

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Work potential of the neuropsychologically disabled adults; fundamental community living and prevocational skills.

Population Characteristics: Mentally disabled adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: To provide basic information in specific content areas which in conjunction with additional measures of sensorimotor skills, emotional adjustment, information processing skills, and vocational, educational and social skills, may provide guidelines for selection, training, and placement of mentally disabled individuals into the community. Can serve as baseline for training; can be curriculum blueprint.

Test Content and Format: Content includes: basic concepts, functional signs, tools, domestic management, health/safety/first aid, public service, time, money, measurement. Multiple-choice pictorial format that permits sampling of several aspects of adaptive behavior. Orally presented. Individually presented. Examinee responds by pointing to picture, large print, graphic presentation. Each of 24 items that constitute a content area is identified on the chart by a word corresponds to the content of the item. Scoring procedure provides item-by-item analysis.

Administration Time: 30-45 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Nine volumes of picture plates, manual, scoring sheet, planning chart, examiner, examinee.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores obtained by summing correct responses within each section. Raw scores can be converted to standardized scores. Results can be converted into scale scores enabling comparison within specific norm group. Scores can be plotted on a profile. Raw scores can be converted into Survival Skills Quotient (SSQ) that allows direct comparison to intelligence quotient. Scores are by age and sex.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms are available for mentally disabled adults (based on a norm group of 500, ages 15-55) and normal adolescents (based on a norm group of 200, ages 14-18).

Reliability: Reliability coefficient on the total test is .97; the standard error of measurement is 3.00.

Validity: Construct validity - similar to PPVT. Used as a component to predict work behavior/potential of neuropsychologically disabled adults.

Comments: SSSQ does not assess maladaptive behavior.

Reference:

Linkenhoker, D., & McCarron, L. (1979). Street survival skills questionnaire. Dallas, TX: McCarron-Dial Systems.

Stromberg Dexterity Test

Publisher: The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Date of Publication: 1951

Competencies Assessed: Speed and accuracy of arm and hand movements.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents and adults.

Recommended Uses: Initial assessment of fine motor skills.

Test Content and Format: Examinee must place 54 red, blue, and yellow discs into appropriate holes in a formboard.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test apparatus and timing device.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores are based on the amount of time taken to complete the task.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms are available on several occupational categories.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Reference:

Stromberg, E. L. (1951). Stromberg dexterity test. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory

Publisher: Stanford University Press
Stanford, CA 94305

Cost: $6.25/25 reusable tests (postage extra)
6.75/50 CPP OpScan answer sheets
6.50/manual
13.00-15.00 Arion II tele-processing
scoring/profile report
1.90-4.25 or less/test
1 day service

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Interests in a wide range of career areas requiring, for the most part, advanced technical or college training.

Population Characteristics: Eighth grade to adults.

Recommended Uses: Career guidance counseling relative to making long-range curricular and occupational choices.

Test Content and Format: S.C.I.I. features 325 items with three response choices. An eighth-grade reading level is required. It is a paper-pencil multiple-choice test asking the examinees to respond either "like," "indifferent," or "dislike" to items covering a broad range of familiar occupational tasks and day-to-day activities. General topics include: occupations, school subjects, activities, amusements, types of people, preference between two activities, and "your characteristics." Self- administered. Suitable for group use.

Administration Time: 30-40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Profiles for students/counselors, answer sheets, pencils.

Derived Scores/Information: Respondent is scored on: 6 General Occupational Themes (based on Holland's RIASEC themes), 23 Basic Interest Scales (measuring strengths and consistency of specific interest areas), and 162 occupational scales (reflecting degree of similarity between respondent and people employed in particular occupations). Complicated nature of scoring necessitates use of computer. Occupational scores are weighted, summed for 85 occupations by sex. These scores are transformed to T-scores. Basic Interest Scales are clustered, scores transformed into standard T-scores for comparison.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Since 1927 edition, the Strong-Campbell has been used with hundreds of thousands of people in diverse occupations. Much published research has been used to develop specialized norms and standardization data.

Reliability: Test-retest correlations and stability of means on Occupational Scales and Basic Interest Scales = .60s to .90s.

Validity: Concurrent validity of Basic Interest Scales was supported by numerous comparisons among people currently in different occupations. There was reported inconsistency between Basic Interest and Occupational Scales. Validity data omits of the report of means and standard deviations for each occupational criterion group on all Occupational Scales, and omits the report of inter-correlations among the Occupational Scales for both sexes. Predictive and discriminative validity is not clearly documented.

Comments: Separate sex norms should be used in scoring.

References:

Strong, E., & Campbell, D. (1977). Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tinsley, H. E., & Tinsley, D. J. (1977). Different needs, interests, and abilities of effective and ineffective counselor trainees: Implications for counselor selection. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24(1), 83-86.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Dolliver, R. H. (1977). Validity studies of the Strong vocational interest inventories. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24(3), 208-216.

Talent Assessment Program (TAP)

Publisher: Talent Assessment, Inc.
P.O. Box 5087
Jacksonville, FL 32207

Cost: $4,125.00 (1981 prices)

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Dexterity, visual and tactile discrimination, and memory as they relate to the functional level of career related attributes.

Population Characteristics: Ages: 13 and over. Grade 8 and over. Trainable mentally retarded and above and disadvantaged.

Recommended Uses: Assesses the functional vocational aptitudes of all individuals. These aptitudes relate to areas that a person has potential to be trained in or placed into. Measures characteristics of work in industrial, technical, and service occupations.

Test Content and Format: A battery of 10 manipulative tests administered individually or in small groups. Described as "all action - no paper"; no reading required

Administration Time: 2 hrs. 40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Paraprofessionals can administer; developers recommend that results are interpreted by trained personnel. Most of the materials are nonconsumable.

Derived Scores/Information: Profiles based on percentiles of one of seven norm groups. Profile sheet denotes individual strengths and provides space for recommendations.

Norming/Standardization Practices: (each based on minimum of 6,000 scores) twelfth-grade male and female students; junior high male and female students; a mentally retarded mixed sex group; male alcoholics, and employed young adults. Sample sizes appear to be adequate but more specific information needs to be provided about the characteristics of the groups.

Reliability: Developers claim a coefficient of stability in limited retesting situations of .86 after a six-month interval. Because of the nature of each subject it is not possible to calculate an internal consistency for split-half reliability.

Validity: Although developers present a section on content, concurrent, construct, and predictive validity, very little persuasive data are revealed.

Comments: Developers recommend using this system with other assessment devices for a more comprehensive evaluation. The test is useful for measuring dexterity, discrimination, and retention of details as they relate to job clusters. The nonreading aspect is cited most often as an asset of this instrument.

References:

Kapes, J.T., & Mastie, M.M. (Eds.). (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Talent Assessment Program. Jacksonville, Florida: Talent Assessment, Incorporated, 1981.

Temperament and Values Inventory (TVI)

Publisher: National Computer Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 1416
Minneapolis, MN 55440

Cost: TVI Specimen Set $14.25, TVI Manual $9.75

Date of Publication: 1977

Competencies Assessed: Measures in individual's self-assessment of attitudes and dispositions that relate to work situations.

Population Characteristics: H.S. Students/Adults with at least 8th grade reading level.

Recommended Uses: In educational settings for career planning; in business and industry for employee development programs; and in clinical practice to provide clues to emotional difficulties that may be work-related.

Test Content and Format: 230 items divided into three sections: two relating to work values, and one to temperament. Temperament Scales include: routine-flexible quiet-active, attentive-distractible. Reward Scales include: social recognition, managerial/sales, benefits, leadership, social service. May be group administered.

Administration Time: 30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Answer sheet, pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Mail-in scoring/Arion II Teleprocessing. Fourteen TVI scales are based on rational-empirical approach and are divided into two types. Seven bipolar temperament scales and seven value scales. Scores are based on the comparison if an individual's answers to the answers of the general population.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Based on these groups by sex: adolescents, aged 15-19 years; young-adult, aged 20-25; and older adults; aged 26-55 years.

Reliability: Test-retest reliabilities for one and two weeks in high .80s.

Validity: Content, construct, and concurrent validity are high and documented in manual.

Comments: This is a good supplement to a vocational interest survey.

Reference:

Johansson, C. B., & Webber, P. L. (1976). Temperament and values inventory. Minneapolis, MN. National Computer Systems, Inc.

Test of Adolescent Language (TOAL)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oaks Blvd.
Austin, TX 78735

Cost: 1984 price data: $66.00/set of 10 test booklets, 50 answer sheets and 50 profiles and manual; $12/10 test booklets: $27/50 answer booklets', $12/50 profiles; $19/manual.

Date of Publication: 1980

Competencies Assessed: Oral and written, receptive and expressive language abilities of adolescents. Subtests: listening/vocabulary/grammar, speaking/vocabulary, speaking/grammar, reading/vocabulary, reading/grammar, writing/vocabulary, writing/grammar.

Population Characteristics: Grades 6-12

Recommended Uses: Assesses the language abilities of students in Grades 6-12. Four stated purposes: (1) to identify students significantly below their peers in language proficiency, (2) to determine language strengths and weaknesses individual students might have, (3) to document students' progress in language as a consequence of special intervention programs, and (4) to serve as a measurement device in research investigations of adolescent language behavior.

Test Content and Format: 19 scores, 8 subtest scores and 11 composite scores; eight paper-pencil and oral response tests; individual administration

Administration Time: 60-180 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, answer booklet, profile sheet

Derived Scores/Information: The sum of the subtest scores yields an Adolescent Language Quotient (ALQ). Composite scores, each with its own norm-referenced quotient, are reported for the following ten areas: listening, speaking, reading, writing, spoken language, written language, vocabulary, grammar, receptive language, expressive language. Age and grade equivalents are not provided.

Norming/Standarization Practices: Standardization population was 2,723 students in grades 6 through 12 in 17 states and 3 Canadian provinces. No identified handicapped persons were included. Male-female and urban-rural distribution of sample with 4 percentage points of national averages. Normative information includes scaled scores associated with subtests, quotients associated with composites, and relationships of TOAL scores to other deviation standard scores. Scaled scores use a mean of 10 and standard deviation of 3.

Reliability: Reliability based on error variance related to content sampling, time sampling, and interscorer differences. Content sampling: 240 subjects used in item analysis showed 70% of coefficients for subtests across grades 6-12 reached or exceeded .80 minimum level. 30% of subtests did not meet .80 criteria and 75% and 50% of subtests did not meet .80

criteria for grades 8 and 9 respectively. Time sampling: 2-week test-retest of 52 subjects, ages 11-14. Coefficients for subtests ranged from .74 to .90, with 3 subtests below the .80 criterion: Listening/Vocabulary (.78), Listening/Grammar (.74) and Spoken/Grammar (.79). Test-retest coefficients associated with composite scores ranged from .82 to .98. Interscorer reliability: mean coefficients ranged from .87 to .98 and percentage of agreement ranged from 82 to 100.

Validity: Evidence for content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity is provided. Content validity is established in extensive discussion of rationale and format of the test and selection of items. Criterion-related validity is reported using 32 junior high school subjects in one Texas town. TOAL scores were correlated with 5 criterion tests. Although there are significant correlations, the small sample size makes the estimates of criterion-related validity quite unstable.

Test for Everyday Living Skills (TEL)

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill
10450 S. Pioneer Boulevard, #5
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Cost: Specimen Set (Manual with key, Technical Report, and one Test Book) $10
Test Books = 20/$35

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Knowledge and performance skills necessary to perform everyday life tasks such as shopping, banking, managing personal finances, obtaining and keeping a job, and maintaining health.

Population Characteristics: Adolescents/young adults who are low-achieving but not mentally retarded.

Recommended Uses: Screening measures, curriculum development, program instruction.

Test Content and Format: Battery of seven life-skill-tests and one basic reading scale. Content domains include (job-search skills, job-related behaviors, health care, home management, purchasing habits, banking and budgeting. Employes oral administration, multiple-choice format with three alternative response options per item. Each test is 33-37 items in length and can be administered to group. Item stem and responses brief to eliminate memory problem.

Administration Time: 15-20 min. per test.

Skills/Materials Required: Administration requires no special training, simulated items, for example, job application form, paycheck stubs, receipts, labels, are contained at end of tests.

Derived Scores/Information: Nine scores: seven content areas, total, and applied reading score, means and standard deviations by grade level and sex. Item analysis included both statistical and content considerations. Scores are in percentage form.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Consisted of approximately 525 junior/middle school and 325 senior high school students during 1977-78 academic year, number taking tests varied due to absenteeism. Four school districts participated: Anchorage, Alaska; Springfield, Oregon; and two in Los Angeles County. Selection was based on willingness to participate. Junior high population was standard, but high school was regular students and remedial students. One month interval allowed for testing to be completed.

Reliability: Coefficient alpha internal consistency: all but one test of junior high population = .77, five of seven tests exceeded .75 in senior high population. No difference in mean performance between males and females. Test means increase with grade level (68% correct in junior high, 79% correct for senior high remedial, and 85% correct for senior high regular). Pearson product-moment correlations: r = .50 - .70, r = .54 - .74.

Validity: Predictive Validity: Demonstrated by increased scores with grade levels. Content sampling and item selection procedures clearly specified and defined through exhaustive reviews of literature relevant to life skills education of adolescents.

Comments: Impact of irrelevant reading skill being eliminated and early diagnostic nature are strengths.

References:

Halpern, A., Irvin, L., & Landman, J. (1979). Tests for everyday living. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, Publisher's Test Service.

Landman, J., Irvin, L., & Halpern, A. (1980). Measuring life skills of adolescents: Tests for everyday living (TEL). Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance. Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance.

Test of Interpersonal Competency for Employment (TICE)

Publisher: James Stanfield and Co.
P.O. Box 1983
Santa Monica, CA 90406

Cost: $249.00 for TICE and Working II

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Social/interpersonal skills necessary for employment in the community.

Population Characteristics: Developmentally disabled, learning disabled, educationally handicapped.

Recommended Uses: Identification of knowledge deficiencies of interpersonal skills necessary for community employment; development of training programs; assessment of progress.

Test Content and Format: 61 items covering two major areas: (a) interactions with supervisors and (2) interactions with co-workers.

Administration Time: 1/2 hour for each of the two sections.

Skills/Materials Required: Designed to be administered by paraprofessionals as well as professionals. All materials necessary are included in purchase price (includes manual, profile sheets and 2 videotapes for Working II).

Derived Scores/Information: Numerical scores and a standardized profile sheet test prescribes to Working II.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Prototype standardized with 206 mildly retarded adolescents and adults in Oregon and Canada. Average age of this sample was 19.4 years and the average full scale IQ was 63.5.

Reliability: Internal consistency reliability = .86 for the supervisor subtest and .79 for the co-worker subtest. Test-retest reliabilities are .85 for the supervisor subtest and .81 for the coworker subtest.

Validity: Authors claim strong content validity due to the behavior analytic procedures used to develop the instrument.

References:

Foss, G., Bullis, M. D., & Vilhauer, D. A. (1984). Assessment and training of job-related social competence for mentally retarded adolescents and adults. In A. S. Halpern & M. J. Fuhrer (Eds.), *Functional assessment in rehabilitation* (pp. 145-157). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Test of Language Development - Intermediate (TOLD-I)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oats Blvd.
Austin TX 78735.

Cost: 1985 price data: $39.75/complete kit including examiner's manual and 50 answer sheets in storage box; $21.00/50 answer sheets; $21.50/manual

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Assesses speaking abilities. Identifies those children who have language problems.

Population Characteristics: Ages 8.6 to 12.11

Recommended Uses: TOLD-I should be used with children for whom English is the primary language and not with children using nonstandard variations of English. By combining various subtest scores, it is possible to diagnose a child's abilities in relation to specific language skills, including: overall spoken language, listening (receptive language), speaking (expressive language), semantics (the meaning of words), and syntax (grammar).

Test Content and Format: 10 scores; 5 subtest scores and 5 composite scores, individual administration: primary level of TOLD also available for ages 4.0 to 8.11. Administered verbally and responses are recorded on an answer sheet which includes a score summary and profile page.

Administration Time: 35-45 min.; untimed.

Skills/Materials Required: Answer sheet, manual.

Derived Scores/Information: Scoring includes raw scores, standard scores, percentile ranks, age equivalents, and quotients.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms obtained from 871 children speaking typical English and representing general population.

Reliability: Reliability data in the form of internal consistency, stability, and standard error of measurement are provided, derived in most part from 200 protocols. stability was based on 30 children tested at an interval of 1 week. Overall, reliability coefficients are substantial.

Validity: Although considerable evidence is presented to support validity, the data are weak in some respects. Concurrent validity data, which used as a criteria the Test of Adolescent Language, was published in 1980 by the same senior authors and others.

References:

Newcomer, P., & Hammi, D. D. (1978). Using the test of language development with language impaired children. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 2, 521-524.

Watson, B. U., Sullivan, P. M., Moeller, M. P., & Jensen, J. K. (1982). Nonverbal intelligence and English and language ability in deaf children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 47, 119-204.

Test of Written Languages (TOWL)

Publisher: PRO-ED
5341 Industrial Oaks Blvd.
Austin, TX 78735

Cost: 1984 price data: $461/complete kit including 50 test/answer sheets, 50 profiles, and manual in storage box; $18/50 test/answer sheets; $12/50 profiles; $19/manual

Date of Publication: 1978-83

Competencies Assessed: Subtests, vocabulary, thematic maturity, spelling, word usage, style, handwriting, plus a written language quotient (WLQ).

Population Characteristics: Grades 3-12

Recommended Uses: To ascertain the general adequacy of a product written by a student and to determine specific proficiency in word usage, punctuation and capitalization (style), spelling, handwriting, vocabulary, and sentence production. Both mechanical and creative aspects of written language are included within the test. Assesses "contrived" and spontaneous" writing samples.

Test Content and Format: 6 subtests plus a written language quotient (based on 4 or 6 depending on age); group administration is acceptable, individual administration may be preferred.

Administration Time: 40 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, profile.

Derived Scores/Information: Results can be expressed as raw scores, percentiles, and standard scores, and as written language quotients (WLQ). Grade and age equivalents are not included due to possible misinterpretation.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Approximately 1,700 students in 9 states were tested with the initial 1978 edition of the TOWL, and 3,418 students from ages 7.0 to 18.11 in 14 states were tested with the revised 1983 edition. Reasonable population distribution is indicated. The inclusion of handicapped and disadvantaged students is not noted in the sample.

Reliability: Presented for internal consistency, test-retest reliability, inter-scorer reliability, and standard error of measurement. Coefficients for standard scores ranged from .62 to .90 for the 6 subtests.

Validity: Content, criteria, and construct validity data available.

Comments: The absence of inclusion of handicapped students in standardization is regrettable since the test is frequently used within the field of special education as part of an assessment battery; research is cited, however, pointing to the ability of the test to differentiate between learning disabled and nondisabled students.

Testing, Orientation, and Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation (TOWER)

Publisher: Institute for Crippled and Disabled (ICD)
400 First Avenue
New York, NY 10009

Cost: $5,000

Date of Publication: 1974

Competencies Assessed: Appraises vocational potential in 14 broad areas of work evaluation.

Population Characteristics: Originally developed for physically disabled persons; it is now used with all types of disabled persons.

Recommended Uses: Vocational exploration; vocational recommendations related to the work samples; recommendations are not highly related to the DOT and are more oriented to training.

Test Content and Format: 93 work samples are divided into 14 areas including clerical, drafting, drawing, electronics assembly, jewelry, leathergoods, lettering, machine shop, mail clerk, optical mechanics, pantograph engraving, sewing, workshop assembly, welding.

Administration Time: 3 weeks to complete entire system.

Skills/Materials Required: 3 weeks training is required. ICD does not sell hardware or equipment; each facility must construct their own.

Derived Scores/Information: A weighted score is obtained in terms of time and quality of work. A 3-page report gives ratings of "Work and Personal Characteristics" for each area and a narrative report.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The system was normed on clients at the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled. Industrial norms, sample sizes, and Characteristics are not given.

Reliability: No data available.

Validity: A 7-city research study produced equivocal results.

Comments: The system Uses a realistic job setting to evaluate clients for a limited group of jobs.

References:

Bates, P., & Pancsofar, E. (1983). Assessment of vocational skills. In A. F. Rotatori & R. Fox (Eds.), Assessment for regular and special education teachers: A case study approach (pp. 335-359). Austin: Pro-ed, Inc.

Botterbush, K. F. (1980). A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Tests of Adult Basic Education, 1976 edition (TABE)

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Cost: $7.25 for multilevel examination kit including descriptive brochure, practice exercise and locator test, practice exercise and locator answer sheet, test book and manual for all levels, battery answer sheet, group record sheet, and test reviewers guide; postage extra; $4.25/25 self-marking (Scoreze) answer sheets for reading, mathematics, or language; $4.00/50 hand-scored battery answer sheets; $5.00/50 answer sheets for third level, Level D. Grades 2-4 - Level E - $12.50/25 tests; $5.00/set of scoring stencils; Grades 4-6 - Level M - $12.50/25 tests; $7.50/set of scoring stencils; Grades 6-9 - Level D - $12.50/25 tests; $7.50/set of scoring stencils/Practice Exercises and Locator Test - $6.50/25 tests

Date of Publication: 1967-76; 1967 edition still available

Competencies Assessed: Provides information about a student's level of achievement in basic skills of reading, math, and language. Level E grades 2-4 - reading (vocabulary, comprehension, total), mathematics (computation, concepts and problems; total); level M grades 4-6 - same as for Level E plus language (mechanics and expression, spelling, total), total; Level D grades 6-9 - same as for Level M

Population Characteristics: Adults at reading level grades 2-4, 4-6, 6-9. Adults wishing to undertake vocational-technical training or general literacy and self-improvement study.

Recommended Uses: Establishes the level at which instruction in basic skills of reading, math, and language should begin. Used by educators to identify individual weaknesses, establish level of instruction, and measure growth after instruction. The three levels of TABE allow selection of appropriate tests for students who funciton at different levels of proficiency in the skills areas. These levels are E (easy), M (medium), and D (difficult). Since the levels are articulated, it is possible to measure continuous student progress in the learning skills.

Test Content and Format: TABE is a reprint of the 1970 edition of California Achievement Tests (CAT-70) for grades 2-4, 4-6, 6-9. Three levels plus a locator test is available to determine appropriate test level. Level E - 6 scores; Level M - 10 scores; Level D - 10 scores. A form for analyzing learning difficulties is printed on the back of the student profile sheet.

Administration Time: Level E grades 2-4 - 88 (127) minutes in 3 sessions; Level M grades 4-6 - 149 (209) minutes in 3 sessions; Level D grades 6-9 - 137 (191) minutes in 3 sessions; practice exercises and locator test - 35-45 minutes; group administration

Skills/Materials Required: Test; locator test (for determining level of test to be administered); separate answer sheets must be used

Derived Scores/Information: Grade equivalent norms and scale scores available

Norming/Standardization Practices: No adult norms available, norms based on children in grades 2-9 using grade point equivalents and scale scores (internal scale of scores across grade levels). Norms were developed for TABE on the basis of the relationship with corresponding CAT batteries. Testing wsa conducted in 1975 to equate the two series: Levels E, M, and D of TABE and Levels 2,3, and 4 of CAT were administered to a randomly selected sample of approximately 19,000 students throughout the U.S. to students in Grades 2-9. For an additional analysis to develop an articulated scale across test levels, students in Grades 4 and 6 were administered adjacent levels of TABE in a test-retest design.

Reliability: No information found

Validity: No information found

Comments: TABE is an adult version of CAT, 1970 edition, that Uses the same content, format, and test organization. Strongly criticized due to its assumption that achievement batteries intended for grade school children can be usefully modified for adult basic education. In addition, there is no effort to provide basic information concerning reliability or validity from the extensive technical information available from the 1970 CAT developmental administrations. Content selection has been adapted only slightly for adults. Test has been praised for its technical production (layout, adequacy of instructions, etc.) and locator test.

Tests of General Educational Development (TGED, also GED)

Publisher: General Educational Development Testing Service
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Date of Publication: 1944-76

Competencies Assessed: Test 1 - Correctness and effectiveness of expression. Test 2 - Interpretation of reading materials in social studies. Test 3 - Interpretation of reading materials in the natural sciences. Test 4 - Interpretation of literary materials. Test 5 - General mathematical ability.

Population Characteristics: Candidates for high school equivalency certificates. Individuals who have not formally completed their secondary school education may be certified as having the equivalent of a secondary school diploma. Also available are the following: (1) civilian restricted forms available to civilian adults including veterans; tests administered throughout the year only at official GED centers; new form issued each September; special editions available for blind and partially sighted; and (2) military restricted forms available to military personnel on active duty; tests administered only at USAFI Testing Sections.

Recommended Uses: To measure as directly as possible the attainment of some of the major objectives of the secondary school program of general education. These major objectives have been identified by the authors of the test as competence in using major generalizations, concepts, and ideas and the ability to comprehend exactly, evaluate critically, and to think clearly in terms of concepts and ideas.

Test Content and Format: Individual or group administered paper and pencil test.

Administration Time: 2 hours/test; 10 hours for all five tests.

Skills/Materials Required: Test form, pencil, administration scoring guide.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores are compared to minimum criteria.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information found.

Reliability: Internal consistency reliability coefficients are generally .90 or higher.

Validity: Although a number of predictive validity studies have been conducted with the GED, content validity is the primary consideration.

Comments: The tests reflect a relatively traditional definition of school course materials. Reading selections in Tests 2, 3, and 4 have been criticized for covering material more heavily from certain academic fields than from others (e.g., in the social studies test, the selections are predominantly from the area of American history and government and in the science test, there is heavy emphasis on biology.

Reference:

Mosel, J. N. (1954). The general educational development tests (high school level) as a predictor of educational level and mental ability. Journal of Educational Research, 48, 129-134.

USES Interest Inventory - II

Publisher: U.S. Department of Labor
Employment Service
Washington, D.C.

Cost: $11.00

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Interests in job-related activities.

Population Characteristics: Counselees with no definite work interests or who have limited knowledge of the variety of jobs and occupational fields.

Recommended Uses: Vocational counseling/employment guidance.

Test Content and Format: 162 work activities keyed to 66 work groups of Guide For Occupational Exploration. Counselee marks each item "likes," "dislikes," or "uncertain." and reviews responses with counselor. Counselor validates responses. Provides a measure 12 Interest Areas of the Guide for Occupational Exploration. Item example: "serves meals in a restaurant."

Administration Time: untimed - (25-30 minutes)

Skills/Materials Required: Test/answer sheet, examiner.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw score for each of 12 scales corresponding to 12 Interest Areas is total number of scale items checked "like." Raw scores are converted to standard scores, and 2 or 3 highest scores provides basis for career exploration.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Administered to 6,539 persons, half were high school seniors, school job applicants, employed workers, or adults in occupational training programs. Sample included Black, Hispanic, American Indian, and Oriental respondents and approximately equal numbers of males and females.

Reliability: Median p values for twelve scales ranged from .17 (males) to .60 (females). Median item-same scale correlations in .50's. Hoyt reliability coefficients range from .84 - .92. Scale intercorrelations in .30's and .40's.

Validity: No validity studies available.

References:

U.S. Department of Labor. (1982). USES test research report no. 36: Development of revised edition of the Interest Check List. Washington, D.D.: U.S. Employment Service.

Droege & Hawk (1977). Development of a USES interest inventory. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 14, 65-71.

VALPAR Component Work Sample System

Publisher: Valpar Corporation
3801 E. 34th Street
Tuscon, AZ 85713

Cost: Individual samples range from $495 to $990 per unit

Date of Publication: Updated continually - dates vary from work sample to work sample - latest is 2/1/81

Competencies Assessed: Vocational and functional skills

Population Characteristics: Disabled and nondisabled; all age groups appropriate for work skills evaluation

Recommended Uses: Produces scores and clinical observations useful for job placement, selection of training programs and design of educational and rehabilitation plans. Designed to measure certain universal worker characteristics (e.g., a person's ability to use eyes, hands, and feet simultaneously and in a coordinated manner).

Test Content and Format: Most samples focus on general work characteristics; some are related to specific job areas. Each sample involves hands-on tasks.

Administration Time: Varies from 10 min. to 6 hours per/work sample time

Skills/Materials Required: Training is not required for purchase, but is highly suggested for those using the work samples. Answer sheets are essentially the only consumable materials necessary.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentiles and Method-Times-Measurement (MTM) percents. Evaluators write and summarize their own results.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample included: Institutional Retarded-Sheltered living; Institutional Retarded-Independent/Community Living-Seminole Community College - Disadvantaged Population; Air Force; San Diego Employed Workers; MTM Industrial Skill Center - Low Income, Unemployed; Deaf-Congenitally Deaf; Severe Congenitally Deaf; Profound. Sample size for each group was about 50. All groups are clearly described.

Validity: Minimal data available. Some degree of content validity information is provided by relating measured characteristics to specific jobs and worker trait groups in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Even though face validity is fairly high, the abstract nature of some of the tasks makes it difficult to associate them with actual job skills.

Comments: VALPAR work samples are well designed, appealing to clients, and relatively easy to administer and score. Components may be added to as program needs change. There is a tendency for the components to focus on physical skills, making them especially useful for the physically and industrially disabled. Because little information is available concerning reliability and validity, the use of VALPAR work samples must be approached with caution.

References:

Kapes, J.T., & Mastie, M.M. (Eds.). (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Smith, C. & Fry, R. (Eds.). (1985). National forum on issues in vocational assessment: The issues papers. Menomenie, WI: Materials Development Center, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute.

VALPAR Component Work Sample Series: #1-13. (1974). Tuscon, Arizona: Valpar Corporation.

VALPAR Component Work Samples Series: #14-16. (1977). Tuscon, Arizona: Valpar Corporation.

Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales
(297 Item Survey Form)*

Publisher: American Guidance Service
Publishers' Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014-1796

Cost: $65 for starter set

Date of Publication: 1984

Competencies Assessed: Communication (expressive, receptive, written); Daily Living Skills (personal, domestic, community); Socialization (interpersonal relations, play & leisure time, coping skills); Motor Skills (gross, fine); Maladaptive Behavior.

Population Characteristics: All children birth to 18 years, 11 months; also appropriate for a wide range of handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals.

Recommended Uses: Useful for identification and placement; program planning; and program evaluation purposes.

Test Content and Format: Semi-structured interview (requires a respondent who is familiar with the individual). Items are statements about what the individual does (e.g. "Sets table with assistance"), Respondents answer "yes, usually"; "sometimes or partially"; "no, never"; "no opportunity," or "don't know."

Administration Time: Typically between 20 and 60 minutes.

Skills/Materials Required: Interview Form; respondent who is familiar with the individual being assessed.

Derived Scores/Information: Standard scores (normalized, mean 100 standard deviation of 15 by age); national percentile ranks; stanines; adaptive level; age equivalents: also percentile ranks for supplementary norms groups.

Norming/Standardization Practices: National Sample of 4800 handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals stratified by 15 age groups, birth to 18 yrs, 11 months. Supplementary norms based on 1050 ambulatory and nonambulatory mentally retarded adults in residential facilities, 134 emotionally disturbed residents ages 9 to 15-6, 185 visually impaired residents ages 6 to 12-11, and 323 hearing impaired residents ages 6 to 12-11.

*Other Forms available (577 Item Expanded Form & 244 Item Classroom Form).

Reliability: (1) Split-half: typically in mid 80s to low 90s for each age group and scale combination, (2) test-retest: typically in 80s for composite score, (3) Interrater: range from .62 to .78 for five adaptive scales.

Validity: Evidence of construct validity includes developmental progression of scores, factor analytic results, and comparisons of supplementary norms groups. Correlations with the K-ABC are highest for communication (.32 to .52), correlations with a variety of other measures are also provided.

Comments: The Vineland has good documentation, clear directions for administration and scoring, and a good discussion of the interpretation of the results. Additional illustrations of interpretation in the context of transition programs would be useful.

References:

Doll, E. A. (1953). Measurement of social competence. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Sparrow, S. S., Balla, D. A., & Cichetti, D. V. (1984). Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales: Survey Form Manual. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

The Vocational Assessment and Curriculum Guide (VACG)

Publisher: Exceptional Education
PO Box 15308
Seattle, WA 98115

Cost: $10

Date of Publication: 1982

Competencies Assessed: Worker Behaviors (attendance/endurance, independence, production, learning behavior); Interaction Skills (communication skills, social skills); Self Help Skills (e.g. dressing appropriately, combing hair, brushing teeth); academic skills (reading/writing, math).

Population Characteristics: Persons with handicaps preparing for entry level competitive employment.

Recommended Uses: Identify skill deficits for competitive employment; prescribe training; evaluate program effectiveness.

Test Content and Format: 49 items requiring yes/no responses or indication of the frequency or percent of time (e.g. "miss no more than ___ work days per month").

Administration Time: 20-30 minutes

Skills/Materials Required: Inventory form to be completed by a respondent who is familiar with the individual being assessed.

Derived Scores/Information: Scores reported on a "percentage of competitive employment" scale for each of the 10 competencies listed above.

Norming/Standardization Practices: No information provided.

Reliability: No information provided. Users may wish to evaluate internal consistency and interrater agreement.

Validity: Items derived from "employer's expectations for entry into light industrial, food service, janitorial service and maid service occupations." Surveys of employers used to obtain expectations. No information provided on correlations of scores with other variables or on changes in scores as the result of training.

Comments: The measure has a good deal of face validity for use in transition programs. There is a need to accumulate evidence of reliability and criterion-related validity, however.

References:

Menchetti, B. (1983). *Assessing the nonsheltered employment survival skills of mentally retarded adults*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Rusch, F., Schutz, R., & Agran, M. (1982). Validating entry-level survival skills for service occupations: Implications for curriculum development. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped*, *7*, 32-41.

Vocational Information and Evaluation Work Sample (VIEWS)

Publisher: Vocational Research Institute
Jewish Employment and Vocational Service
1700 Sansom St.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Cost: $7,675 including hardware and tools for 16 work samples, training for one evaluator, and a 2-day consultation visit.

Date of Publication: 1976

Competencies Assessed: Vocational potential and work related behaviors.

Population Characteristics: Mentally retarded (severe/profound-EMR) 14 years and up.

Recommended Uses: Constructing vocational components of IEPs. Making recommendations for vocational training and placement. Utility oriented toward counselor.

Test Content and Format: 16 work samples from 4 fields of work. Each sample has a demonstration and learning phase. The client must master the sample before assessment begins.

Administration Time: 5 six-hour days

Skills/Materials Required: Training provided with purchase of system. Consumable materials average $3.50 per client. 95% of all hardware, tools and machines are nonconsumable.

Derived Scores/Information: Elapsed time for production, raw scores for errors, percentage of predetermined time standards. Report is a seven-page narrative describing functional abilities, performance scores and making placement recommendations.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norm group was a mentally retarded population of 452 persons (Mean IQ = 53) served by vocational rehabilitation facilities and schools.

Reliability: No data available

Validity: No data available

Comments: The length of time a client takes to reach criterion performance before assessment begins can provide useful information. Each work sample is provided with industrial time standards (MODAPTS).

References:

Botterbush, K. F. (1980). A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Kapes, J. T., & Mastie, M. M. (Eds.) (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Breuning (Eds.), Assessment the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Vocational Interest, Temperament and Aptitude System (VITAS)

Publisher: Vocational Research Institute
Jewish Employment and Vocational Service
1700 Sansom St., 9th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Cost: $8,199

Date of Publication: 1979

Competencies Assessed: Vocational aptitude across a variety of work trait groups.

Population Characteristics: Educationally and culturally disadvantaged persons of both sexes. Could be used with physically handicapped or mildly retarded persons.

Recommended Uses: To make vocational recommendations concerning feasible worker trait groups and necessary support services.

Test Content and Format: Individually administered; 21 work samples covering tasks related to a variety of occupations.

Administration Time: 15 hours

Skills/Materials Required: VITAS work samples, cassette recorder, record forms, string and sheet metal.

Derived Scores/Information: The minutes to completion are converted to a 1-2-3 rating. No percentiles or standard scores are used. Errors are also converted to a 3-point rating.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The work samples were normed on over 400 CETA clients in 6 centers throughout the country. The sample was 60% female with a mean age of 28.6 years and an 11th grade education; 66% were white. The norms do not include any data on the time and error data, only 1-2-3 ratings are given. No employed worker or time standard norms are given.

Reliability: No information found.

Validity: No information found.

Comments: Many of the work samples are refinements of the JEVS system. There is no practice period so that the effects of training are not observable. Many of the tasks are abstract and provide little information relevant to actual job skills.

Reference:

Zimmerman, B. (1979). Vocational interest temperament and aptitude system. In A. Sax (Ed.), Innovations in vocational evaluation and work adjustment. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, *12*, 29-31.

Waksman Social Skills Rating Form (School Edition)

Publisher: ASIEP Education Co.
P.O. Box 12147
Portland, OR 97212
(503) 236-1317

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Aggressive/passive behaviors in social situations, for example, school, work situations.

Population Characteristics: All grade levels/handicapped children and adults.

Recommended Uses: To give specific information to specialists and support personnel who may need to evaluate/prescribe services - counseling, placement, programming, education.

Test Content and Format: 21 Specific behavior descriptors selected from commercial social skills training programs with over 50% agreement consensually by panel of experts. Responses are on a Likert-type scale from "usually" to "never." Item example: "insults others," "threatens others," etc. Teacher rated. Examiner scored. Includes item scores, aggressive and passive subtotal domains, and total score. Two domains: aggressive and passive include the 21 items.

Administration Time: 20-30 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Teacher assessment, checklist, pen/pencil.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores can be converted to percentiles by sex and grade. Domain means and standard deviations are available by sex and grade levels. Males scored higher than females at all grade levels except 9-12.

Norming/Standardization Practices: 331 Kindergarten through high school students in the Portland, Oregon greater metropolitan area (169 male, 162 female) participated in the standardization. Students were selected from the school registration lists and teachers, middle school and high school students were randomly selected from one of six to eight classes. All teachers asked to complete scale one month later. All students were in regular classes for a minimum of two months. At 9-12, females scored higher on passive domain M = 3.62, S.D.=4.85, N = 331 (aggressive); M = 6.56, S.D. = 5.99, N = 331.

Reliability: Split-half reliability = .92. Test-retest (over one month and one week) = .63 to .74. Interrater reliability = .60.

Validity: The rating form effectively discriminates between "average" and "emotionally disturbed" middle school students at .0005 level of significance. Items factor analyzed using an oblique rotation with Kaiser normalization of common factors. Aggressive domain accounted for 73.5% of variance; passive accounted for 26.5% of variance.

Comments: The items on this test are similar to Burk's Behavior Rating Scales.

Reference:

Waksman, S. A. (1983). Waksman social skills rating form (school edition). Portland, OR: ASIEP Education Company.

Walker Problem Behavior Identification Checklist: Revised - 1983 (WPBIC)

Publisher: Western Psychological Services
12031 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90025

Cost: $12.13

Date of Publication: 1983

Competencies Assessed: Nature and extent of behavior problems.

Population Characteristics: Grades Preschool - 6

Recommended Uses: Counseling and diagnostics.

Test Content and Format: 50 item paper-pencil inventory consisting of behavior statements which apply to child being rated. Includes 5 scales: Acting-out, withdrawal, distractibility, disturbed peer relation, and immaturity.

Administration Time: 5 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Checklist, manual

Derived Scores/Information: Total score with cut-off scores weighted to represent handicapping influence, scores converted to T-scores for interpretation.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Norms available for preschool, primary, and intermediate samples.

Reliability: Split-half = .98. Test-retest ranged from .43 - .88 across 5 scales.

Validity: Lacks interrater reliability. Although it is among best checklists, validity was questioned and no numbers were specified in MMY - 9th edition.

References:

Walker, H. (1983). Walker Problem Identification Checklist: Revised 1983. Los Angeles, CA.: Western Psychological Services.

Schneider, B. (1982). Predictors of post-intervention community adjustment for emotionally disturbed elementary school children, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 11, 157-162.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $87.50 complete set; $80 without carrying case; $3.70/25 record booklets; $1.75/25 supplementary record sheets; $4.75/manual; postage extra

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Assesses intelligence in adolescents and adults

Population Characteristics: Ages 16 through adult

Recommended Uses: Measure of general intellectual functioning as a guide to identification, placement, and programming.

Test Content and Format: 12 subtests: Verbal - information, comprehension, arithmetic, similarities, digit span, vocabulary; Performance - digit symbol, picture completion, block design, picture arrangement, object assembly. Some units of the test require verbal responses from the subjects, and others require the subject to manipulate test materials to demonstrate performance ability. Examiner required. Individual administration.

Administration Time: 75 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Kit, manual, record booklet, supplementary record sheet

Derived Scores/Information: Raw subtest scores converted into scale scores x=10, S.D.=3. Verbal, performance and full scale I.Q. scores of X=100, S.D.=15.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Standardization sample consisted of 1,880 Americans, equally divided by sex and stratified according to the 1970 U.S. census data, with the controlled variables being age, race, sex, geographic location, urban-rural, education, and occupation. Nine age groups ranging from 16-74 years; normative sample did not include psychiatric or neurological problems. Standardization procedure is well described.

Reliability: Coefficients for subtests varied from low (.52) (object assembly, 16-17 yrs) to high (.96). Average coefficients for verbal, performance, and full scale I.Q. scores .97, .93, and .97, respectively.

Validity: The validity of the WAIS has been soundly established. Recent studies indicate (1981) that WAIS I.Q. scores are approximately 7-8 points higher than on the WAIS-R. Compares positively as indicator of achievement with Wide Range Achievement Test and other I.Q. tests.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R)

Publisher: Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Ct.
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952

Cost: $41.00/set (25 record booklets, maze/coding test, manual); 3.60/25 record booklets; 3.40/25 maze/coding tests; 6.50 manual.

Date of Publication: 1974

Competencies Assessed: Verbal intelligence, nonverbal intelligence, and full scale intelligence.

Population Characteristics: 6-17 years of age.

Recommended Uses: To obtain an estimate of overall intellectual functioning to aid diagnosis and placement.

Test Content and Format: Individual administration; 12 subtests organized into verbal and performance scales. VERBAL - information, comprehension, arithmetic, similarities, vocabulary, digit span; PERFORMANCE - picture completion, picture arrangement, coding, object assembly, block design, mazes. Written and oral tasks.

Administration Time: 50-75 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test kit, record booklet, manual, stopwatch.

Derived Scores/Information: Standard scores (X = 100, S.D. = 15) compared only with others same age; equal means and standard deviation (100 and 15 respectively) for Full Scale I.Q., Verbal I.Q., and Performance I.Q. Standard score (X = 10, S.D. = 3) for each subtest

Norming/Standardization Practices: Represents population of U.S. children according to 1970 census. Standardized on 2,200 males and females. Sample stratified for race, region of country, sex, rural/urban.

Reliability: Split-half coefficients at 7 1/2, 10 1/2, 13 1/2 = .92, .95, .94, respectively.

Validity: Small-scale investigations suggest that the WISC and the Stanford-Binet correlate .80 or higher.

Comments: Identifies cognitive strengths and weaknesses. Helpful with learning disabled assessment and special education eligibility; Some sex stereotyping, more racial representation in items.

References:

Kaufman, A. (1979). Intelligent testing with the WISC-R. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Ryan, C., Vega, A., Longstreet, C., & Drash, A. (1984). Neuropsychological changes in adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 335-342.

Sacco, W. P., & Graves, D. J. (1984). Childhood depression, interpersonal problem-solving, and self-ratings of performance. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 13, 10-15.

Wechsler, D. (1974). Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Weller-Strawser Scales of Adaptive Behavior: For the Learning Disabled (WSSAB)

Publisher: Academic Therapy Pub.
20 Commercial Boulevard
Novato, California 94947

Cost: $15

Date of Publication: 1981

Competencies Assessed: Assesses the adaptive behavior of elementary and secondary school learning disabled students.

Population Characteristics: Elementary, secondary grades.

Recommended Uses: Used to determine severity of disabilities and to identify areas requiring remedial attention.

Test Content and Format: Multiple item paper-pencil form covering the following areas: social coping, relationships, pragmatic language, and production. Scales completed by teacher or diagnostician following a period of observation and placed on 3-point rating scale.

Administration Time: 15 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Manual, forms, examiner

Derived Scores/Information: Total score and subtest scores define the behavior problems as mild to moderate to severe. Results allow examiner to develop compensatory teaching techniques to help student cope with situations at school, home and so on. Items do not reflect sex bias.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Items evolved from tape-recorded interviews with learning disabilities teachers. A total of 236 students, 154 elementary and 82 secondary students from 6 states in mid-central, mid-western, southern, and western regions of nation.

Reliability: Internal consistency = split-half = .99 for elementary and .99 for secondary at .001 level of significance (standard error of measurement ranged from .34 - .47 on subtests). Interrater reliability - between teachers = .88 for elementary and .89 for secondary at or above .01 level of significance.

Validity: Content - teachers and panel of experts; construct - intercorrelation of items = .88 -.91 with median .90 at elementary and .88-.92 with median of .90 for secondary at or above .001 level of significance. Subtest to total in .90s at or above .001 level of significance. Suggested future correlations with other measures.

References:

Minskoff, E. H. (1980). Teaching approach for developing non-verbal communication skills in students with social perception deficits: Part I. The basis approach and body language clues: Part II. Proxemic, vocalic, and artifactual cues. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13(3) and (4), pp. 9-15 and 34-39.

Weller, C., & Strawser, S., (1981). Weller-Strawser scales of adaptive behavior. Novato, CA: Academic Therapy Publications.

Wide Range Achievement Test,Revised Edition (WRAT-R)

Publisher: Guidance Associates of Delaware, Inc.
1526 Gilpin Ave.
Wilmington, Del. 19806.

Cost: (1985) $9.25/50 tests, $13.00/manual, $9.00/Specimen set, cash orders postpaid.

Date of Publication: 1984

Competencies Assessed: Measures basic educational skills of spelling, arithmetic, reading. Reading includes recognizing and naming letters and pronouncing printed words; spelling includes copying marks resembling letters, writing name and printing words; and arithmetic includes counting, reading number symbols, oral, and written computation.

Population Characteristics: Ages 5-11, 12 and over.

Recommended Uses: Can be used for educational placement, measuring school achievement, vocational assessment, job placement and training.

Test Content and Format: 3 scores: spelling, arithmetic, reading; 2 levels; Level 1 for ages 5-11 and Level 2 for ages 12 and over; Individual administration in part with provision for group administration of some parts under specific conditions. In order to address those young or mentally retarded individuals for the easier items of the regular test would be too difficult, an oral section is provided, to be used below a specified age or for examinees who do poorly on the regular test. Subtests may be administered in any order.

Administration Time: 20-30 min., 10 min. for each subtest

Skills/Materials Required: Record booklet for both levels; manual; test. Optional word lists for both levels of the reading and spelling tests are offered on plastic cards, and a recorded pronunciation of the lists is provided on cassette tape. The tape itself can be used to administer the spelling section. A one-level edition is available for clinicians and teachers who are willing to spend more time in testing in order to be able to analyze error patterns. A large print edition is available for those who require magnification of reading material.

Derived Scores/Information: Grade equivalents, standard scores, and percentiles are available.

Norming/Standardization Practices: The WRAT-R was standardized using a stratified national sample technique; 5,600 individuals were included in the norms, including 200 people in each of the 28 age groups from 5 years, 0 months to 74 years, 11 months.

Reliability: Both internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities appear to be adequate. Test-retest reliability coefficients were determined on a selected number of individuals from the normative sample. Reliabilities for Level 1 (ages 7.0 to 7.5 and 10.0 to 10.5) were .96 for reading, .97 for spelling, and .94 for arithmetic. For Level 2 (ages 13.0 to 13.5 and 16.0 to 16.5) were .90, .89, and .79 for the areas above, respectively.

Validity: Content, construct, and concurrent validity are reported. In terms of concurrent validity, correlations of the WRAT with the PIAT, the California Achievement Test, and the Stanford Achievement Test are reported. However, no validity studies are reported employing the WRAT-R, but it is very similar in content to previous editions of the test, and results of previous studies may still be applicable. Some comparisons of the WRAT-R and earlier editions of the WRAT are provided, but these appear on close reading to be of questionable appropriateness.

Comments: The WRAT-R should be used only as a screening instrument for the determination of a global achievement level. Restricted item content and high intercorrelations among the subtests render it unsuitable for use as a diagnostic tool in the identification of specific skill deficits. Its desirable features are that it can be administered and scored easily and quickly and it is an acceptable alternative to group administered achievement tests. The WRAT-R is an age-normed test, meaning that each individual taking the WRAT-R can have his/her score compared with a like aged group of individuals which are representative of the national population.

References:

Bae, A. Y. (1968). Factors influencing vocational efficiency of institutionalized retardates in different training programs. American Journal Mental Deficiency, 72 (May), 871-874. (DA 42:14397).

Kaufman, H. I. (1967). Cognitive and noncognitive indices of employability in a sampling of 17 to 21 year old mentally retarded individuals. Doctoral thesis, Marquette University (Milwaukee, Wis.), 1967. (DA28:3027A)

Wide Range Employability Sample Test (WREST)

Publisher: Jastak Associates, Inc.
1526 Gilpin Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19806

Cost: Employability Sample Set $995.00; Specimen set $26.45 (contains manual and summary profiles)

Date of Publication: 1980

Competencies Assessed: Work productivity, both quantity and quality; manipulation, dexterity.

Pouplation Characteristics: Age 16 through adults, general population as well as sheltered workshop and industrial settings.

Recommended Uses: Measures technical skills, provides standardized method of job skill learning, assists in job selection or employability level

Test Content and Format: Short battery of 10 work samples covering folding, stapling, packaging, measuring, stringing, gluing, collating, color matching, pattern matching, and assembling

Administration time: 2 hrs.

Skills/Materials required: Instructions are clear for administration and scoring. More detailed guidelines for interpretation of scores would be helpful. Resupply kits of consumables and summary profile forms are necessary.

Derived Scores/Information: Raw scores, standard scores, percentiles, summary profile forms

Norming/standardization practices: Production quantity norms: general population, workshop, industrial. Production quality norms: general population, workshop, industrial. Size and specific characteristics of smaple groups not given.

Reliability: Test-retest correlations over 3 mos. are in the .90s for N=428. Internal consistency: coefficient alpha of .82 for males, .83 for females

Validity: Correlations between WREST standard scores and supervisor's ratings of 428 "production workers" were .86 for quantity and .92 for quality of performance

References:

Jastak, J. & Jastak, S. (1979). Wide range employability sample test (WREST). Wilmington, DE: Guidance Associates of Delaware Inc.

Kapes, J.T., & Mastie, M.M. (Eds.). (1983). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Menchetti, B.M., Rusch, F.R., & Owens, D.M. (1983). Assessing the vocational training needs of mentally retarded adults. In J.L. Matson and Breuning, S.E. (Eds.), Assessing the mentally retarded (pp. 247-284). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Wide Range Interest-Opinion Test (WRIOT)

Publisher: Jastak Associates, Inc.
1526 Gilpin Ave.
Wilmington, DE 19806

Cost:
$9.60/test
5.70/50 answer sheets
30.00/set of scoring stencils
$5.70/50 report forms
5.40/manual
46.50/specimen set
postage extra
.90/test-scoring service

Date of Publication: 1972

Competencies Assessed: Vocational interests and attitudes.

Population Characteristics: Grades K-12 and adults, unskilled labor to the highest levels of technical, managerial, and professional training.

Recommended Uses: Designed to be used with learning disabled, mentally retarded, and the deaf. Does not require reading ability.

Test Content and Format: WRIOT is a pictorial interest test which is culturally and sexually unbiased. It does not require reading or language understanding. Pictorial presentation reduces the confusion of mental images and multiple meanings that words evoke. It contains a reusable booklet containing 150 sets of 3 pictures each, from which likes and dislikes are picked by forced choice and recorded by the test taker on an answer sheet. The test can be individually or grouped administered, but individual administration is necessary for persons who are too limited by age, mental ability, or physical limitations to complete the answer sheet with written responses.

Administration Time: 40-60 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test booklet, answer sheet, scoring stencils.

Derived Scores/Information: Results are presented on a report form which graphically shows an individual's strength of interest in each of the 18 interest clusters as well as 8 more general attitude clusters. This report form can be given to the client for vocational counseling purposes.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Normed on seven age groups from age 5 through adulthood and separately for males and female. 15% minorities were included in the sample.

Reliability: Grade/age levels are not reported. T-Form Split-half reliability (150 males/150 females) = .80. No calculation on retarded/ children.

Validity: Authors do not report evidence supporting the validity of the WRIOT.

References:

Jastak, J. F., & Jastak, S. (1979). *Wide range interest-opinion test*. Wilmington, DE: Jastak Associates.

Zytowski, D. C. (1978). Wide range interest-opinion test. *The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.

Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (WJPEB)

Publisher: DLM Teaching Resources
P.O. Box 4000
One DLM Park
Allen, TX 75002

Cost: (1983) Complete set, $125.00 (Book One and Book Two containing all 3 parts of battery, 25 response booklets for each book, cassette tape); $3.25/desired; subtest scores booklet; $69.00/Book One, 25 response booklets, and cassette tape; $9.50/25 Book One response booklets; $69/Book Two and 25 Book Two response booklets; $9.50 per 25 Book Two response booklets; $18.00/technical manual (softbound); $59/microcomputer scoring diskette.

Date of Publication: 1978

Competencies Assessed: Evaluates individual cognitive ability, scholastic achievement, and interest level. Part One (cognitive ability), 12 scores: picture vocabulary; spatial relationships, memory for sentences, visual-auditory learning, blending, quantitative concepts, visual matching, antonyms-synonyms, analysis-synthesis, number, reversed, concept formation analogies; Part Two (achievement), 10 scores: letter-word identification, word attack, passage comprehension, calculation, applied problems, dictation, proofing, science, social studies, humanities; Part Three (interest level), 5 scores: reading interest, mathematics interest, language interest, physical interest, social interest; plus 4 derived scores referred to as Relative Performance indexes: reading, mathematics, written language, knowledge.

Population Characteristics: Preschool-adult, ages 3-80

Recommended Uses: Applications of the battery include individual identification of special problems or disabilities, diagnosis of specific weaknesses that may interfere with related aspects of development, occupational and instructional selection and placement, individual program planning, guidance, prediction and confirmation of future performance, evaluation of individual growth, evaluation of programs, research, and psychometric training.

Test Content and Format: 27 test battery divided into three parts. 31 scores. Some parts are paper and pencil tests. It can be administered in its entirety or as single tests or clusters to meet specific appraisal needs. Individual administration. Not for group use.

Administration Time: 60-90 min. for Part One, 30-45 min. for Part Two, and 15-30 min. for Part Three

Skills/Materials Required: Test books, response booklets, cassette tape, and a technical manual, which may be ordered separately. Cassette tape provides pronunciation guide and an alternative form of administration of the battery. Separate answer sheets must be used. 1 form. Part One manual included in Book One. Part Two and Part Three manual included in Book Two.

Derived Scores/Information: Percentile ranks, percentile scores, and standard scores

Norming/Standardization Practices: A three-stage stratified design was used in the selection of examinees for the standardization sample. A school-age normative sample included 3,935 children in grades K through 12, with 555 in the 3-5 age range sample, 503 in the 18-64 age range sample, and 97 in the age 65+ sample

Reliability: The median reliability coefficient for the Broad Cognitive Scale is .97, with a range of .96 to .98 across age levels. The median reliabilities for the Cognitive Clusters are: Verbal, .90; Reasoning, .87; Perceptual Speed, .70; and Memory, .85. Of the four Cognitive Clusters, only the Perceptual Speed Cluster is somewhat low in regard to reliability.

The median reliabilities of the Reading, Mathematics, Written Language and Knowledge Aptitude Clusters all fall at or above .89.

Similar to other instruments the reliability drops slightly for preschoolers. The reliabilities for the Preschool Knowledge Cluster are: .90 for age 3; .92 for age 4; and .93 for grade K. The reliabilities for the Preschool Skills Cluster are: .84 for age 3; .86 for age 4; and .93 for grade K. These cluster score reliabilities are respectable in view of the difficulties usually associated with reliability in a preschool population. Data on test-retest stability were not presented.

Validity: Validity data considered very comprehensive. Criterion-related validity studies are reported for "normal" children and adults as well as for special populations (e.g., mentally retarded, learning disabled, and learning/behavior disordered). Impressive concurrent validity coefficients for the Tests of Cognitive Ability, Reading, Mathematics, Written Language, and Knowledge Clusters in conjunction with appropriate anchor tests are presented in the technical manual. For example, the sample at grades 3, 5, and 12 of the Broad Cognitive Scale correlated .79, .79, and .83 with the WISC-R.

Comments: Available in Spanish. The WJPEB is the first major individual instrument that includes measure of cognitive ability, academic achievement, and scholastic interest, to be standardized on the same norming sample. Thus, when making eligibility decisions for placement in learning disabilities programs, the uncontrolled variance associated with comparing a student's performances or separately normed cognitive and achievement scales, is non-existent.

References:

Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1982). Interjudge agreement in classifying students as learning disabled. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 209-220.

Loper, A. B., & Reeve, R. E. (1983). Response bias on a locus of control measure by learning-disabled children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 11, 537-548.

Naglieri, J. A., & Pfeiffer, S. I. (1981). Correlations among scores on WISC-R and Woodcock-Johnson achievement tests for learning disabled children. Psychological Reports, 49, 913-914.

Reeve, P. T., & Loper, B. (1983). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation in learning disabled children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 57, 59-63.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M. R., & McGue, M. (1982). Similarities and differences between low achievers and students classified learning disabled. Journal of Special Education, 16, 73-85.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests (WRMT)

Publisher: American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Bldg.
Circle Pines, MN 55014

Cost: (1985) $43.50/kit for Form A or B, 25 response forms, and manual; complete set of both Forms A and B, $78.00; complete set of both Forms A and B in carrying case, $105.00; $7.75/25 response forms; Form A or B, 1-4 pkgs each, $7.00, 5 or more pkgs, each

Date of Publication: 1973

Competencies Assessed: Measures individual reading achievement; letter identification; word identification; word attack; word comprehension; passage comprehension; total reading.

Population Characteristics: Grades K-12

Recommended Uses: WRMT's coverage of this wide K-12 age span with a single instrument, coupled with the availability of parallel forms, is an especially useful feature. Used to detect reading problems. For classroom grouping, program evaluation, clinical and research use.

Test Content and Format: 6 scores, 2 forms, 5 subtests. Individual administration. Only those items within the student's functioning level are administered.

Administration Time: 30-45 min.

Skills/Materials Required: Test forms A and B; manual; response forms; easel format

Derived Scores/Information: Derived scores in 6 competency areas assessed at each of 4 levels: easy reading level (96% mastery), reading grade score (90% mastery), failure reading level (75% mastery), and relative master of grade level. Grade equivalents, grade percentile ranks, age equivalents, standard scores, and mastery scores. Normal curve equivalents for Chapter 1 programs are available for grades 2-6. Derived scores are provided for each of the five subtests and the total reading composite.

Norming/Standardization Practices: Item Response Theory (Rasch) was used to calibrate and norm all test items. Norms are based on performance of a national standardization sample. Supplementary norms by sex, and socioeconomic status (SES) adjusted norms which permit comparisons of students from communities having similar SES characteristics are available. Norming took place over a two-year period with approximately 1,000 subjects from K-grade 7 and 4,000 subjects from K-grade 12. All norming data were gathered from students enrolled in regular classrooms. Six students--three boys and three girls--were randomly selected from each grade within a school. All students were administered the complete set of five norming tests.

Reliability: Split-half and alternative-form reliabilities for the current form are reported only for grades 2 and 7. Correct split-half reliabilities for four of the subtests is quite high, ranging from .83 to .99. In fact, however, the subscore reliabilities range from .20 to .99 by the split-half method. Of the 20 final-form subscore reliabilities given, 7 are below .9 and 13 at or above .9. The test-retest reliabilities range from .16 to .94, with median .84.

Validity: Validity is drawn from four sources: content validity, a multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis, further intercorrelation data, and a predictive study using the WRMT's mastery scale. The multimethod-multitrait analysis was conducted on the data obtained on a sample of second grade subjects and seventh grade subjects. At grade 2, validity was .84 for letter identification, .94 for word identification, .90 for word attack, .90 for word comprehension, and .88 for passage comprehension. At grade 7, validity was .16, .93, .85, .68, and .78 for each of the above areas, respectively.

Comments: Unusual variety of derived scores has been criticized owing to their confusion in converting raw scores to "mastery scores" to normal scores. Content validity of WRMT has been criticized in relation to isolated aspects of subtests. Reviewers disagree on use of the test as a global screening measure for reading disability and its use as a precise tool for a reading diagnostician because of the precision of the subtests' content.

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological testing, 5th Ed*. New York: Macmillan.

Bates, P., & Pancsofar, E. (1986). Assessment of vocational skills. In A. F. Rotatori & R. Fox (Eds.), *Assessment for regular and special education teachers: A case study approach*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Bolton, P. (1987). *Handbook of measurement and evaluation in rehabilitation*. Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Botterbusch, K. F. (1982). *A comparison of commercial vocational evaluation systems* (2nd ed.). Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Botterbusch, K. F. (1981). *Work sample: Norms, reliability and validity*. Menomonie, WI: Materials Development Center.

Brolin, D. E. (1982). *Vocational preparation of persons with handicaps* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Brookings, J., & Bolton, B. (1986). Vocational interest dimensions of adult handicapped persons. *Measurement and evaluation in counseling and development*, *18*, 168-175.

Browning, P., & Irvin, L. K. (1981). Vocational evaluation, training and placement of mentally retarded persons. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *25*, 374-409.

Chalfant, J. C. (1984). *Identifying learning disabled students: Guidelines for decisionmaking*. Burlington, VT: NERCC.

Cone, T. E., & Wilson, L. R. (1981). Quantifying a severe discrepancy: A critical analysis. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, *4*, 359-371.

Coulter, W. A., & Morrow, H. W. (Eds.). (1978). *Adaptive behavior: Concepts and measurements.* New York: Grune & Stratton.

Danielson, L. C., & Bauer, J. N. (1978). A formula-based classification of learning disabled children: An examination of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *11*, 163-176.

Feuerstein, R., Rand, Y., & Hoffman, M. B. (1979). *The dynamic assessment of retarded performers: The learning potential assessment device theory instruments and techniques.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Field, T. F., & Orgar, W. (1983). *Measuring worker traits*. Athens, GA: VDARE Service Bureau.

Halpern, A. S., & Fuhrer, M. J. (Eds.). (1984). *Functional assessment in rehabilitation*. Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Halpern, A. S., Lehmann, J. P.,. Irvin, L. K., & Heiry, T. J. (1982). *Contemporary assessment for mentally retarded adolescents and adults*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Haring, N. C., Liberty, K. A., & White, O. R. (1980). Rules for data-based strategy decisions in instructional programs: Current research and instructional implications. In W. Sailor, B. Wilcox, & L. Brown (Eds.). *Methods of instruction for severely handicapped students*. Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Hawkins, R. P. (1979). The functions of assessment: Implications for selection and development of devices for assessing repertoires in clinical, educational, and other settings. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *12*, 501-516.

Heller, K. A., Holtzman, W. H., & Messick, S. (Eds.). (1982). Placing children in special education: A strategy for equity. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Hunter, J., & Hunter, R. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. Psychological Bulletin, 96, 72-98.

Irvin, L. K., & Halperin, A. S. (1979). A process model of diagnostic assessment. In G. T. Bellamy, G. O'Connor, & O. C. Karan. Vocational rehabilitation of severely handicapped persons. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Kapes, J. J., & Mastie, M. M. (1982). A counselor's guide to vocational guidance instruments. Falls Church, VA: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Kazdin, A. E. (1977). Assessing the clinical or applied importance of behavior change through social validation. Behavior Modification, 1, 427-451.

LaGreca, A. M., Stone, W. L., & Bell, C. R. (1982). Assessing the problematic interpersonal skills of mentally retarded individuals in a vocational setting. Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 3, 37-53(b).

Lerner, J. W. (1984). Learning disabilities: Theories, diagnosis and teaching strategies (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Matson, J. L., & Breuning, S. E. (Eds.). (1983). Assessing the mentally retarded. New York: Grune & Stratton.

McLeod, J. (1979). Educational underachievement: Toward a defensible psychometric definition. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12, 42-50.

Mellard, D., Cooley, S., Poggio, J., & Deschler, D. (1983). A comprehensive analysis of four discrepancy methods (Research Monograph No. 15). Lawrence: University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.

Menchetti, B. M. (1983). Assessing the nonsheltered employment survival skills of mentally retarded adults. Doctoral dissertation, Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Menchetti, B. M., Rusch, F. R., & Owens, D. (1983). Assessing the vocational needs of mentally retarded adolescents and adults. In J. L. Matson & S. E. Bruening (Eds.). Assessing the mentally retarded. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Meyers, C. E., Nihira, K., & Zetlin, A. (1979). The measurement of adaptive behavior. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.). Handbook of mental deficiency, psychological theory and research. Hillside, NJ: Lawrene Erlbaum Associates.

Minnesota State Department of Education. (1983). Guideline handbook for defining and serving students with specific problems in learning disabilities. Minneapolis: State of Minnesota, Department of Education.

Mitchell, J. V. (Ed.). (1985). The ninth mental measurements yearbook (2 vols.). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Mithaug, D. E. & Hagmeier, L. D. (1978). The development of procedures to assess prevocational competencies of severely handicapped young adults. AAESPH Review, 3, 94-115.

Mithaug, D. E., Mar, D., Stewart, J., & McCalmon, D. (1980). Assessing prevocational competencies of profoundly, severely and moderately retarded persons. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped*, *5*, 270-284.

Moore, S., & Hessler, G. L. (1980). *Considerations for identifying school-age children and youth with specific learning disabilities: A final institute report*. Minneapolis: Michigan Department of Education.

Murphy, S. T., & Ursprung, A. (1983). The politics of vocational evaluation: A qualitative study. *Rehabilitation Literature*, *44*, (1-2), 2-12.

Nihira, K. (1985). Assessment of mentally retarded individuals. In B. B. Lodman (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence theories, measurement and applications*. New York: Wiley, pp. 801-824.

Pancsofar, E. (1986). Assessing Work Behavior. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.) *Competitive employment: Service delivery models, methods, and issues*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Pancsofar, E., & Bates, P. (1984). Multiple-baseline designs for evaluating instructional effectiveness. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *28*, 67-77.

Pickett, J. M., & Flynn, P. T. (1983). Language assessment tools for mentally retarded adults: Survey and recommendations. *Mental Retardation*, *21*, 244-247.

Power, P. W. (1984). *A guide to vocational assessment*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Reynolds, C. R., Berk, R. A., Boodoo, G. M., Cox, J., Gutkin, T. B., Mann, L., Page, E. B., & Wilson, V. L. (1984). *Critical measurement issues in learning disabilities*. Report of the U.S. Department of Education.

Rusch, F. R. (1983). Competitive vocational training. In M. E. Snell (Ed.), *Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. (1981). *Assessment in special and remedial education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sattler, J. (1982). *Assessment of children's intelligence and special abilities* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schalock, R. L., & Karan, O. C. (1979). Relevant assessment: The interaction between evaluation and training. In G. T. Bellamy, G. O'Connor, & O. C. Karan (Eds.). *Vocational rehabilitation of severely handicapped persons*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Shepard, L. A. (1983). The role of measurement in educational policy: Lessons from the identification of learning disabilities. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices*, *2*(3), 4-8.

Shepard, L. A. (in press). Identification of mild handicaps. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3d ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Sherman, S. W., & Robinson, N. M. (1982). *Ability testing of handicapped people: Dilemma for government, science, and the public*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. (1983). LD or not LD: That's not the question. *Annual Review of Learning Disabilities*, *1*, 26-28.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (1983). *Identification/classification research: An integrative summary of findings* (Research Report No. 142). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.

Research Faculty at the University of Illinois

Janis Chadsey-Rusch
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Lizanne DeStefano
Assistant Professor of
Educational Psychology

Jane Dowling
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

James W. Halle
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Delwyn L. Harnisch
Assistant Professor of
Educational Psychology

Laird W. Heal
Professor of Special
Education

Robert L. Linn
Professor of Educational
Psychology

L. Allen Phelps
Professor of Vocational
Education

Adelle M. Renzaglia
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Frank R. Rusch
Professor of Special
Education

Richard P. Schutz
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Robert E. Stake
Professor of Educational
Psychology

Institute Advisory Committee

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute
University of Illinois

Donn Brolin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology
University of Missouri-Columbia

R. Brian Cobb, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Vermont

Marge Goldberg, *Co-Director*
Pacer Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Sally S. Hoerr, *President*
National Parent Chain
Peoria, Illinois

Dean Inman, Ph.D.
Director of NERC
Center on Human Development
University of Oregon

Luanne Meyer, Ph.D.
Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Syracuse University

William Schill, Ph.D.
College of Education
University of Washington

Susan S. Suter, *Director*
Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services

Edna Szymanski
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
Senior Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
New York State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Craig Thornton, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research
Princeton, New Jersey

Paul Wehman, Ph.D.
Director
Rehabilitation, Research and Training Center
Virginia Commonwealth University

TRANSITION
INSTITUTE
AT ILLINOIS